

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



BT

97

.A2

m64

PT
97
A2
M64

H. White

R E M A R K S
ON
T W O P A M P H L E T S

Lately published against

Dr. *Middleton's Introductory*
Discourse, &c.

**BOOKS written by the Rev. Doctor MIDDLETON,
and printed for R. MANBY and H. S. COX on
Ludgate-Hill.**

I. **A**N INTRODUCTORY DISCOURSE to a larger Work design'd hereafter to be publish'd, concerning the *Miraculous Powers* which are suppos'd to have subsisted in the *Christian Church*, from the earliest Ages, through several successive Centuries; tending to shew, that we have no sufficient Reason to believe, upon the Authority of the *primitive Fathers*, that any such powers were continued to the Church after the *Days of the Apostles*. With a Postscript, containing some Remarks on an *Archidiaconal Charge*, delivered last Summer by the *Rev. Dr. Chapman*, to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of *Sudbury*.

II. A Treatise on the ROMAN SENATE. In Two Parts.

The first Part contains the Substance of several Letters formerly written to the late *Lord Hervey*, concerning the Manner of creating Senators, and filling up the Vacancies of that Body in *Old Rome*.

The Second Part, which is now added, contains a distinct account, 1. Of the Power and Jurisdiction of the *Senate*. 2. Of the Right and Manner of convoking it. 3. Of the Places in which it was usually assembled. 4. Of the legal Times of holding their Assembly. 5. Of the different Ranks and Orders of Men in the *Senate*, and of the Forms observed in their Deliberations. 6. Of the Nature and Force of their Decrees. 7. Of the peculiar Dignity, Honours and Ornaments of a *Roman Senator*.

III. The History of the Life of *Marcus Tullius Cicero*. The third Edition. In three Vols. 8vo.

N. B. There are a few Copies remaining of the large *Quarta Edition*, which may be had at Subscription Price.

IV. *Germana quædam Antiquitatis eruditæ Monumenta* quibus *Romanorum Veterum*, *Ritus varii tam Sacri quam Profani*, *tum Græcorum atque Ægyptiorum nonnulli illustrantur*, *Romæ olim maxima ex parte collecta*, ac *Dissertationibus jam singulis instructa*. His *Appendicis item Loco adjuncta est Mumie Cantabrigienfis Descriptio*. Beautifully printed in a *Royal Quarto*, adorned with twenty three Copper Plates, curiously engraved.

IV. The Epistles of *M. T. Cicero* to *M. Brutus*, and of *Brutus* to *Cicero*; with the Latin Text on the opposite Page, and English Notes to each Epistle. Together with a prefatory Dissertation, in which the authority of the said Epistles is vindicated, and all the Objections of the Reverend Mr. *Tunstall* particularly considered and confuted.



Middleton, Conyers D.D.
REMARKS
ON

TWO PAMPHLETS

Lately published against

Dr. Middleton's Introductory Discourse.

The ONE, intituled,

OBSERVATIONS on that DISCOURSE
in answer to the Author's Prejudices, &c.

The OTHER,

The JESUIT-CABAL farther opened,

OR

A Defence of Dr. Chapman's late Charge, &c.

With a PREFACE to these REMARKS,

Giving a brief Account, of a certain Book, which professes to exhibit a full, true, and comprehensive
View of CHRISTIANITY, &c.

As it was taught and practised by the Universal Church,
during the first Four CENTURIES.

With some occasional Reflections on the said Book.

L O N D O N :

Printed for R. MANBY and H. S. COX on *Ludgate-Hill.*

M DCC XLVIII.

BT

97

A2

M64

English
Honey
4.28.43
47837.

(i)

PREFACE.

I Have lately met with a certain book, which, though written without any reference to Dr. *M—n's Introductory Discourse*, and with a view quite opposite to it, is yet so particularly connected with the subject of it, and consequently, with the present debate, which is grounded upon it, that I have thought it necessary, on this occasion, to give the reader a short abstract of it, as a proper preface or introduction to the following remarks.

The purpose of it, as it is declared by the Title-page, is, "To give a true and
" comprehensive view of Christianity ;
" or to set forth the complete duty of
" a Christian, in relation to faith, prac-
" tice, worship and rituals, without re-
" gard to any modern Church, Sect or
" Party ; as it is taught in the holy
" Scriptures, was delivered by the Apost-
" les, and received by the universal

a

" Church

“ Church of Christ during *the first four*
 “ *centuries*. The whole laid down in
 “ two Catechisms; the first, for the use
 “ of Children; the second, of more
 “ knowing Christians.”

Now when a controversy was actually on foot, concerning the principles and characters of the primitive Fathers; and a question moved among Divines, whether they were the most favourable to the Popish or to the Protestant cause, nothing could come out more apposite to the purpose, or more effectual towards the decision of it, than a performance of this kind; setting forth by a deduction of facts and instances, what were the genuin doctrines and practices of those ancient Fathers, during *the four first centuries* of the Christian Church. This book therefore I would recommend to the attention of the reader: For this will enable him to judge, of the real merit of *the Introductory Discourse*, which has been attacked and decry'd by several writers, and especially by these two, with whom I am now engaged.

The

The Author of these Catechisms, appears to be a man of sense and learning; warmly persuaded of the truth and importance of what he delivers; and delivering it with much piety and gravity, and with more candor, than we commonly observe in writers of his zeal and principles. The plan also of Christianity, which he has proposed to us, seems to be a fair and just representation of the discipline of the primitive Church, or of such a part at least, as he thinks fit to recommend to the practice of the present age. And if we grant him his main principle, that *unwritten tradition*, as it is exemplified by the universal practice of the antient Fathers and Churches, is of *Apostolic Origin*, we must grant likewise, that all the rites and doctrines, which he has deduced from it, are the essential parts of the Christian religion, and of equal obligation with the Gospel itself. Yet on the whole, this learned, candid, and pious performance will be found, upon examination, to confirm every thing, that

Dr. M— has any where said, concerning the danger of adopting the discipline of those primitive ages, as a pattern or rule of duty to Protestants.

His scheme in general is this: that true religion consists, in believing and practising every thing, which God has revealed to us, either *by his written word or unwritten tradition; both which are known to be God's word by the evidence of the Catholic Church* [a]. He declares tradition to be, *that sacred depositum of doctrine and practice which was delivered by Christ to the Apostles; by the Apostles, to the first Bishops; and by them, to their successors and Priests, of the universal Church, from age to age.* [b] That all points of doctrine and discipline, which were *antiently and universally received by Christians, without any known beginning, have always been looked upon, as Apostolic traditions:* that *this consentient practice of the Catholic Church, is the test, by which true traditions are distinguished from false* [c], that these

[a] P. 151.

[b] 142.

[c] 142.

traditions

P R E F A C E.

v

traditions may be called *the common law of the Church*; and the decrees of Councils, *it's statute-law*: and that no Church can be rightly constituted, *which does not observe them, or has any laws contradictory to them* [d].

He defines the Church to be, *the Society of all the faithful, who profess to serve God, according to that true religion, which God himself taught, and which they received from their forefathers, and have faithfully preserved without alteration*: that the marks of the true Church are four; It is *one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic*; preserving the doctrine of the Apostles, by a continued succession of Pastors, derived originally from them [e]. Which succession we know

[d] P. 191, 192. [e] 161, 162.

These are the same marks of the true Church, which the Papists have always alledged against the Protestants, as being found in their Church, and not in any Protestant Church. Thus in a short treatise on this very subject, published by an able Popish writer, in the beginning of *Q. Elizabeth's* reign, and when the settlement of religion was under the deliberation of the Parliament, the author concludes his argument in these words. "To be short, the Church of Protestants is not *One*, for lack of one head: not *Holy*, for lack of benefits: not *Catholic*, because it hath not indured at all times, places, and persons: not *Apostolic*, because they cannot shew their succession from the Apostles downward, nor can go upward lineally to the Apostles, which

thing

know to have been *uninterrupted, from the times of the Apostles, down to the present [f]*: that if it *should ever once fail, it would be impossible to renew it, without the miraculous interposition of Christ himself: for if the whole Christian world should unite their suffrages together, they could not give any authority, to offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist, or to perform any other part of the pastoral office in the Church; it being a power, which Christ has reserved to himself [g].*

That this universal Church, as it is now militant on earth, is made up of all the particular faithful Churches; of each of which the Bishop is the visible head. *That a particular faithfull Church consists of a rightful Bishop, with his Clergy and laity united to him, pro-*

“ thing is plain. Therefore the Church called Papistical, having
 “ one head, the Pope, having benefits of God, by flourishing, and
 “ miracles, being spread at all times, in all places, through all per-
 “ sons that is to say, for the most part, being able to shew their
 “ pedigree, even to the Apostles, without any interruption; that
 “ Church, I say, is the onely true Church, whereof we make men-
 “ tion in our Belief, saying, I believe the Holy Catholic Church.
 See *Strype's Annals of Q. Eliz.* Append. p. 36.

[f] P. 151. [g] 282.

Jeffing

professing the true faith, without the addition of false doctrine, and practising the necessary Christian worship, without corruption. Hence flows the necessity of living and dying in the communion of the Church, out of which salvation is not ordinarily to be had. For we cannot be united to Christ, *without communicating with the holy Catholic Church, and the onely means of communicating with the Catholic Church, is, by being members of a particular faithfull Church* [b].

To this general view of his primary and fundamental principles, I shall now add a summary account of the chief articles of that pure and primitive Christianity, which he has built upon them.

To begin then with the sacraments. In the office of Baptism, he prescribes, as necessary to the due administration of it, all the same ceremonies, which are now actually practised by the *Romish* Church, tho' with some little al-

[b] P. 162.

teration, or the addition rather of more foppery and superstition, than is to be found even in the Popish ritual. The person, to be baptised, must in the first place be *exorcised* by the Priest, by *blowing thrice upon his face, signing him with the sign of the Cross, and pronouncing a certain form of authoritative words, commanding the Devil to depart out of him.* He next makes a *solemn renunciation of the Devil; and a vow of perpetual obedience to Christ:* in which renunciation, *he must turn his face to the West, as being opposite to the region of light, and representing the Prince of darkness, whom he renounces:* but in making his vow to Christ, he must *turn again to the East, where Paradise was planted, which is now again laid open to him:* then he must be *anointed on the head and shoulders with holy oil, consecrated for that purpose by the Bishop, to enable, him, to wrestle the more successfully with the Devil:* then he is to be

be plunged three times under water; once at the name of each person of the blessed Trinity; to represent the faith, into which he is baptised; and also the three days burial of Christ, and his resurrection on the third day; with several other mystical senses, there specified: after this, he must be anointed again with *holy Chrism*, or a compound of oil and balm, consecrated by the Bishop; and is to be cloathed with a *white Garment*, the emblem of that purity, to which he has devoted his life: then he receives *the kiss of peace*, in token of his incorporation into the Church: and lastly is made to taste of *consecrated milk and honey*, to denote his spiritual infancy, and his entrance into the land of rest, of which *Canaan*, the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey, was a type [i].

As to the Eucharist, the *true and full notion* of it, he says, is this; that it is a *religious feast upon bread, and*

[i] P. 227, &c. 232.

wine

wine mixed with water, which have first been offered in sacrifice to God, and are become the mysterious body and blood of Christ [k]. He affirms it to be, a *real and proper sacrifice*; and calls sacrifice in general, the *most perfect, efficacious, and honorable service*, that we can pay to God [l]; and the particular sacrifice of the Eucharist, *the most excellent worship, which God ever prescribed to men [m]*: which by its *purgative and expiatory nature procures a general remission of sin for the whole Church, and atones likewise for the wilfull transgressions of particular sinners*: of which sacrifice, Christ, at the time of the institution, *consecrated his Apostles to be the Priests*, with a power of consecrating others to succede them, and carry on the same Priesthood to the end of the world [n].

The sacramental part of the Eucharist, *is the Feast upon this sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ; which*

[k] P. 240. [m] 240, 279.
[l] 250. [n] 267, 268, 270.

being

being offered to God upon the Altar by the Priest, is consumed afterwards in common by the Priest and people by eating and drinking; for it was made too holy a thing by it's consecration, to be treated as the antient sacrifices were, or to be laid on the fire in whole or in part, but was to be consumed intirely, in the most honorable manner, that is, to be eaten and drunk by the faithful, in an act of most solemn devotion. He declares, that as Christ, by the words of the institution, made the bread and the cup to be his body and blood, in type and figure, so God, by his acceptance of this most excellent sacrifice, caused the Holy Spirit to give it the highest degree of sanctity, of which any sacrifice is capable, and to make it the very body and blood of Christ, in real power and energy, and to all intents and purposes of religion, or as far as it was possible for one thing to be made another, without changing the substance. And this, he says, was the certain and universal belief

belief of the Antients, that as the natural body of Christ was formed in the womb of the blessed Virgin, by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, so, by the operation of the same Spirit, the bread and the cup were made his body and blood in a more effectual manner, than as mere representatives [o].

He affirms also, that the contents of the Eucharistic cup, must necessarily be wine, *mixed with water*; and employs four intire chapters, to prove this mixture to be *of divine institution*; and that it was the universal doctrine of the Catholic Church, for above 1500 years, *that our Saviour practised, instituted and commanded the mixed cup*; and made water therefore, *as well as wine, an essential ingredient [p]*. Lastly, he largely and strongly insists on the duty and necessity of *Infant-communion*, or of bringing all infants, even of the tenderest age, to partake of this sacrifice: which he

[o] P. 285, 296, 297.

[p] 315, &c.

enforces

enforces by a similar practice both of the *Jews* and Gentiles, and the parity of those arguments, which are acknowledged for Infant-baptism; and, above all, by the constant practice of the primitive Church through the three first centuries, which he deduces very particularly in several distinct chapters [q]. After the celebration of the Eucharist, he recommends the revival of the *Agape, or Love-feast* of the primitive Christians; which was a common entertainment, provided out of the voluntary oblations of the richer communicants, in order to feed the poorer: and was held, he says, *for above three centuries and an half, within the Church*; and tho' prohibited afterwards in Churches, continued still to be held in private houses; as an *usefull and laudable rite, and not onely of Apostolic origin, but of great service to the Christian Church* [r].

To these two sacraments of the Gospel, the Church of *Rome* has added:

[q] P. 367.

[r] 393, &c.

five,

five, but this Protestant Catechist, ten; which he calls *lesser Sacraments*. Five of them belonging to Baptism; *Exorcism*, anointing with oil, the white garment, a taste of milk and honey, and the unction by holy Chrism; the other five are, the sign of the Cross, Imposition of hands, the Unction of the sick, Holy Orders and Matrimony [s]. The three last of these are held also as sacraments by the *Romish Church*, together with confirmation and penance, but instead of confirmation, this writer introduces, imposition of hands, which they call the outward sign of it: and though he does not make a sacrament of Penance, yet he enjoins it, as a necessary duty to all Christians; with private confession also to a Priest, which the *Romanists* reckon, as the outward sign of it [t]. And in truth, all his *lesser sacraments*, are nothing else but so many *Popish* ceremonies, now actually practised by that Church; which,

[s] P. 224.

[t] 410, &c.

upon the authority of tradition, and the primitive Fathers, he declares to be so essential, that *it is not in the power of the universal Church, to alter or lay them aside* [u]. And as to the sign of the Cross, tho' the Romanists make use of it in all their Sacraments, and prescribe it likewise in all the offices of private life, declaring it, as this author also does, to have wrought many miracles, yet Popish superstition never reached so far, as to advance it to a Sacrament.

As to the other parts of our worship due to God, he prescribes a constant attendance on the public, and daily service of the Church, *every morning and evening, and on the penitential offices, peculiar to Wednesdays and Fridays*; which appear, he says, *from Tradition, to have been days appointed for divine worship by the Apostles, as well as Sundays*. And besides these stated times, he requires us to attend

[u] P. 195.

also

also devoutly, *on the public prayers of the Church at Baptism, Confirmation and Ordination; at Matrimony, the Churching of women, and burial of the dead; at the consecration of oil, the milk, the honey and the Chrism; and at all the other benedictions, and Ecclesiastical prayers, which are said over different persons and things on different occasions: because all these offices were composed by great saints, out of the words of scripture, and preserved by ancient tradition, and designed to sanctify all our actions, and use of all the creatures.*

As to our private devotions and prayers, besides the morning and night, he prescribes a repetition of them, *every third hour of the day; at nine in the forenoon, twelve at noon, and three in the afternoon; as being the fixed times of performing them, during the three first centuries: and he recommends it to those zealous Christians of heroic piety, who would imitate holy David*

vid, Paul *and* Silas, to extend their devotions also to *the third hour of the night*: according to which division of the day and night into equal spaces of three hours each, all the returning times of prayer have acquired the following Latin names in the Romish Church; *Prime* or *Matins*, in the morning: *Tierce*, at nine, or the *third hour*: *Sexte*, at noon, or the *sixth hour*: *None*, at three, or the *ninth hour*: *Vespers*, at six, in the evening: *Compline*, at nine at night: *Nocturns*, at midnight: and *Lauds*, at three, in the morning, or the time of *Cock-crowing*. To which *Heroic* pitch of devotion, as he calls it, no Christians of these later days have had the presumption to aspire, or the honor to reach, except some Monkish orders of the Popish Church, or a few wild Enthusiasts, or crafty zealots, heroically ambitious of the honor of a Saintship. But to give some ease however under so laborious a devotion, to Christians especially engaged in business, he observes,

b

that,

that, if they frequent the public offices of the Church, *their devotions at these hours may be very short*; and proposes to them *the sign of the Cross*, made with this form of words, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen*: As the shortest and most significant of all prayers: because we confess by it, *the mystery of the Trinity*; and, *by the motion of our hand, expresses the figure of the Cross, or the mystery of our redemption, with that also of the incarnation, on which it depends* [*x*]. Lastly, in the act of praying, whether public or private, he directs us, to turn our faces *towards the East*, according to *antient tradition*, and adds several reasons, which were alledged for it by the Primitive Fathers [*y*].

He affirms likewise, upon the same authority, the duty of *praying for the faithfull deceased*: that *as the Saints in Paradise pray for us, so we ought to pray for all those, who departed in*

[*] P. 175.

[y] 176.

the faith, but cannot attain the completion of their happiness, 'till the final day of judgment. That we should pray even, *for the forgiveness of their sins*: for their present separate state being the consequence and punishment of Sin, and a state of imperfection, in which the soul is capable of improvement, it follows, *that prayers and alms and Eucharistic sacrifices, offered for them in the Church, may increase the blessedness of their intermediate state, and prevail for the abatement of those rigors, which they might otherwise suffer in the conflagration of the last day* [z].

All these sacramental rites and offices of devotion, which I have hitherto recited, are deduced by him from what he calls, *the common law of the Church*; that is, the practice and custom of primitive Antiquity: but he has collected also from it's *Statute-law*, or the decrees of Councils, *six particular Commands of the Church*, as he calls them,

[z] P. 164.

b 2

which

which he enjoins to all Christians, as of equal obligation.

The first command is, *to abstain from eating blood.* Which he declares to have been observed *by the holy Church throughout the world, even to the tenth century;* and that it is laid upon all Christians, *by the law of God, and the tradition and Canons of the primitive Church, to eat of no animal, but what is so killed, that the blood of it may be naturally poured out [a].*

The second is, *to offer to God our tithes, first fruits, and voluntary oblations.* This he calls *a necessary branch of divine worship,* and declares, that God had appropriated to himself *our tithes,* or the tenth part of our substance, *from the beginning of the world: and that the oblation of our first fruits is commanded also by the Holy Ghost,* and in all religions, ages, and countries of the world, was ever esteemed a part of divine worship. But besides *our*

[a] P. 204.

tithes and first fruits, which are due by the divine law, God expects from us also *voluntary oblations* ; in the measure of which however he leaves us at our liberty ; *yet the more we offer, the more acceptably we serve him*. These are to be paid to his servants and receivers, the Priests ; tho' not for their own use, but to be deposited in the hands of the Bishop, *as a standing treasury, for the support of the Church, the maintenance of the Clergy, and the relief of the poor, of which the Bishop is to have the disposal, as being Christ's vicar, the prime steward of Gods's revenues, and the chief master of his household* [b].

The third is, *to observe the Festivals of the Church*. These are divided into the greater and lesser. The greater are, *Easter-day, the first Sunday after Easter, Ascension-day, Whit-sunday, all the Sundays of the year and Christmas-day* [c]. The lesser are, *all the days between Easter and Whit-sunday, ex-*

[b] P. 205. ~~46~~.

[c] 208.

cept Sundays : in which we solemnize our Saviour's resurrection for fifty days successively, during which time all fasts are suspended, and we are to pray standing, as on all Sundays, in token of joy, and thereby make every one of these days equal in a manner to Sundays. All Saturdays or Sabbaths likewise, except that before Easter, are lesser Feasts, having been sanctified by God from the creation of the world, and in memory of that, continued to be observed by the primitive Christians, as Festivals of devotion. Monday also and Tuesday after Whitsunday, the Circumcision, Epiphany, the Purification and Annuntiation of the blessed Virgin, and all the other Saints days, marked in our present Calendars, are in the number of his lesser Festivals [d].

The fourth is, *to observe the Fasts of the Church : which are divided also into the greater and lesser. The greater are holy Saturday, or the day before*

[d] P. 209.

Easter ;

Easter ; which the Primitive Christians kept with a *vigil and pernoctation*, in memory of our Lord's resurrection, which happened early the next morning ; about which time they expected also his second coming. The next Fast in strictness is *Good Friday*, the preceding day ; on which our Lord was crucified. But the primitive Church joined them both together, as *one Fast of forty hours, and kept it as an Evangelic command*. The other greater Fasts are the *other four preceding days of the same week before Easter*, as preparatory to the more strict and solemn observance of *Good Friday and Holy Saturday*. The lesser Feasts are, *the Stations, and Lent*. The *Stations* are, *all the Wednesdays and Fridays of the Year* ; being weekly commemorations, of our Lord's being sold by Judas on Wednesday, and crucified on Friday ; and are called *Stations*, in allusion to military stations and keeping guard. The use of these Fasts is, *to punish ourselves for our sins, by*

b 4 suffering

suffering hunger and thirst, depriving ourselves of our pleasures, and even of a part of our necessary nourishment. For by mortifying of the flesh and weakening the body, we fortify the mind, and dispose it the better for prayer, compunction, and serious thoughts [e].

The fifth is, *to offer and receive the Eucharist, on every holy day ; at least, on all the greater Festivals : which relaxation the Church indulged, he says, that she might secure a weekly celebration of it on all Sundays, besides the Ascension and Christmas-days : which is the least, that is required of all Christians, both by scripture and tradition : and those, who willfully omit it on the Lord's day, do virtual'y excommunicate themselves for a time [f].*

The sixth command of the Church is *to pray standing on all Sundays, and on every day, between Easter and Whitsunday, out of respect and remembrance of our Lord's resurrection, which was*

[e] P. 210.

[f] 217.

observed

observed by all Churches, from the beginning, on the authority of *Apostolic tradition*, and especially enforced, by the 20th Canon of the first great Council of Nice. A. D. 325. the posture of kneeling is adapted onely to occasions of humiliation and penitential devotion, but that of standing, he says, *is a beautifull symbolic representation of our Lord's resurrection*; proper to raise our thoughts from the earth, and to unite them more closely with God, and the things above: and no ceremony of the Church can be more efficacious for the purpose of elevating the mind, and inflaming the affections, and stirring up the faculties of the soul [g].

As to the honors which were paid to *the Martyrs* by the Primitive Churches, he informs us, “ that their *reliques or the remains of their bodies* were carefully preserved and embalmed and “ wrapped up in rich cloaths, and the “ very drops of their blood gathered

[g] P. 219

“ up,

“ up. That, on the days of their Mar-
 “ tyrdoms, the Christians used to meet
 “ together, to celebrate their memories
 “ and honor their nativity, as they cal-
 “ led it, or their entrance into eternal
 “ life: that they made these days Fes-
 “ tivals, like Sundays, and assembled
 “ at their Tombs, to thank God for
 “ their example, and to excite one ano-
 “ ther to imitate it, by reading their
 “ acts, and the history of their suffer-
 “ ings: and that God worked miracles
 “ at their Tombs, and often at their
 “ Martyrdoms, by which several per-
 “ sons present and even their execu-
 “ tioners and Judges had sometimes
 “ been converted [*b*].

His account likewise of the origin
 of Monkery, in the primitive ages, is
 this, “ that from the beginnings of Chris-
 “ tianity, there were certain persons in
 “ the Church, called *Ascetics*, who,
 “ from a desire of attaining to a great-
 “ er perfection, than that of common

[*b*] P. 146.

“ Christians,

“ Christians, professed to exercise them-
 “ selves in great austerities, after the
 “ example of *John Baptist*. These ex-
 “ ercises were, to abstain wholly from
 “ flesh and wine ; to fast for two or
 “ three days successively ; to spend their
 “ time chiefly in devotion ; to give up
 “ themselves and their substance to
 “ the service of God and the use of
 “ the poor and distressed, confining
 “ themselves to a single life, and mak-
 “ ing themselves Eunuchs for the king-
 “ dom of Heaven, inuring themselves
 “ to great hardships, watchings, sleep-
 “ ing on the ground, for the promotion,
 “ of piety and religion : all which se-
 “ verities were voluntary, and exercis-
 “ ed without any compulsive rules.

“ But about the middle of the third
 “ century, in a time of persecution,
 “ great numbers, to avoid the fury of
 “ it, fled into the deserts of *Ægypt*,
 “ where they employed themselves in
 “ acts of piety, and divine contempla-
 “ tions ; and found that sort of life so
 agreeable,

“ agreeable, that when the persecution
 “ ceased, they chose to continue still in
 “ that solitary state, whence they came
 “ to be called *Monks*. They lived at
 “ first in little cells or cottages, which
 “ they built for themselves : but to-
 “ wards *the middle of the fourth cen-*
 “ *tury they were brought to live in*
 “ *communities, and under rules by St.*
 “ *Pachomius*; who procured Monaste-
 “ ries to be built for them about *Thebais* :
 “ and many holy persons, who were
 “ desirous to keep up the exact prac-
 “ tice of the Christian religion, which
 “ they saw declining, chose this kind
 “ of life. They spent their time in
 “ manual labor, and in meditating on
 “ the holy scripture; fasted every day
 “ ’till towards the evening, and then
 “ seldom tasted any thing more, than
 “ bread and water : they assembled to-
 “ gether to pray at the evening and in
 “ the night; slept little, kept a pro-
 “ found silence, practised all sorts of
 “ virtues, and lived in perfect obedience
 “ to

“ to their superiors, though there were
 “ sometimes *several thousands of them*
 “ under one Governor, for in a short
 “ time they multiplied exceeding-
 “ ly [i].

“ From the same beginnings and in
 “ the same manner, were formed also
 “ the primitive societies of *religious vir-*
 “ *gins or nuns*. Who practised the
 “ same austerities, of *silence, poverty,*
 “ *watchings, and continual prayer*: and
 “ there were several saints, who drew
 “ up rules for the Monastic life of both
 “ the sexes; which soon spread through
 “ all Christendom; for *St. Martin of*
 “ *Tours* brought it into *France in the*
 “ *fourth century*; and *Pelagius* is
 “ supposed to have brought it into
 “ *England, about the beginning of the*
 “ *fifth* [k].”

From this short sketch of the Christian duties, deduced at large by this author, from the united authority of *Scripture and tradition*, the reader will easi-

[i] P. 147.

[k] 149.

ly perceive, what would be the consequence, of admitting them, as a *rule of faith and practice to Protestants.*

For in the first place ; the necessity of a Priesthood, derived by a lineal descent from the Apostles, if acknowledged by all Christians, as it is affirmed by this writer, would create incurable disorders in all Protestant communities. According to this principle, if the Priesthood should once fail, the whole Christian worship would be dissolved at once, without the possibility of a renewal, but by a new commission or revelation from heaven. Now *this uninterrupted succession of Priests* is allowed to the Church of *Rome*, but denied by many to the Church of *England*, and not so much as pretended to, by any other Church or Sect of Protestants whatsoever : among whom consequently, neither the Christian Sacraments, nor any part of the pastoral office can be administered, without a sacrilegious profanation, and impious defiance

fiance of Christ himself. How forcibly then would any scruples of this kind operate on weak and religious minds, towards driving them into the arms of that Church, in which alone, they could be sure of receiving the absolution of their sin, from the hands of an Apostolic Confessor.

Secondly, From this plan of primitive Christianity we may observe, how tradition, instead of serving to that use, which is more peculiarly ascribed to it, of adding light and illustration to the obscurer parts of the gospel, serves onely to perplex and obscure it the more, by multiplying quæstions, ingrafting new doctrines upon it, clogging it with tiresome ceremonies, and converting it from a rational, to a ritual service. The article of *the Eucharist* will confirm this reflection. Our Lord's institution of it, as it is related by all the Evangelists, is comprized in a few words, in which he prescribes *a solemn and religious commemoration of his death and sufferings,*

ings, to be perpetually observed in his Church: the frequent celebration of which, by a natural tendency and effect, could not fail to excite, in all his faithfull disciples, a warm affection and zeal for the memory of their Master, and confirm their resolutions of living conformably to his precepts. But tradition is no sooner called in, to the interpretation of it, than it envelopes it presently in clouds of mystic darkness; transforms it into *a proper and propitiatory sacrifice, offered for the dead, as well as the living*; declares the materials of it, the bread and wine, as soon as consecrated by the Priest, to be no longer mere representatives, or types of Christ's body and blood, but converted, by the operation of the holy Spirit, into the same thing with Christ himself, in power and energy, and to all intents and purposes of religion, tho' in mystery, not in substance. It mingles the Eucharist cup also, with *wine and water*, tho' by the words of the institution,

tution, it appears to have had nothing in it but wine, and affirms *this mixture to be of divine appointment*, tho' there be not the least mention of it in any part of the Gospel. And, to make this sacred office still more burthensom, it in-joins to us, as a necessary duty, to bring all infants, even of the tenderest age, to partake of it; a practice, which must needs disturb the solemnity of it, and dissipate the attention, of all who assist at it. And declares this Sacrament, not onely to be *necessary to salvation*; but *a means, by which a principle of an happy resurrection is conveyed into our bodies* [k].

Thus the *true and full notion*, as he calls it, of *the Eucharist*, delivered originally by our Lord, within the compass of two or three verses, when dressed out in all the trimmings, with which tradition has equipped it, takes up *an hundred and fifty pages, or about eighty intire chapters of this Author's larger*

[k] p. 287.

C

Cate-

Catechism. He apologizes indeed for his prolixity on this article, on the account of it's importance and *the many controversies, which have arisen about it in the Christian Church; and because the whole of our religion may fairly be summed up in it* [l]: for there is no other article, he says, *which requires more pains and study to be rightly informed in, and that to believe it, is indeed a work of labor* [m]. But this very apology for the length of his doctrine, seems to be a confutation of the truth of it. For it is certain, that an institution, which cannot be explained without so much learned pains, could never be designed for the most excellent part of a worship, which was calculated for the common salvation of all men; or that tradition at least cannot be the proper interpreter of it, which makes it so difficult to be understood, that it is *a labor to believe it.*

[l] p. 393.

[m] 311.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, We may observe also, from this same book, what is notorious likewise in the Romish Church, that tradition, wherever it is admitted into a partnership of authority with the Scriptures, instead of serving as it's handmaid, as some of our Divines affect to call it, has always acted the Mistress, taken the lead, and got the ascendant so far, as to eclipse the credit of the written word, reduce it as it were to a dead letter, and even banish it at last from the use of the people. Thus in *the primitive Catechism* now before us, among all the various rites and doctrines laid down as essential to Christians, for every single one derived immediately from the Gospel, we may reckon twenty, I dare say, deduced entirely from tradition.

Fourthly, We may now see, from a clear deduction of facts and instances, as they are set forth in this piece, how directly the authority of the primitive Fathers and their traditions tends to lead

us into the Church of *Rome* : we see it ascribing a supreme and independent power to the Church ; asserting the Popish sacraments ; a propitiatory sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, both for the living and the dead ; prayers for the dead, to procure some relief and improvement of their intermediate state ; Exorcisms, Chrisms, consecrated oil, sign of the Cross, penances, confessions to a Priest, absolutions, reliques of Saints ; Monks ; the preference of a single life, to the married, as of gold to silver ; in short almost every thing, now practised or professed by the Romanists ; except *the universal supremacy* of the Pope, which is disputed by the Papists themselves ; *the divine worship of Saints*, which they also disavow and endeavour to elude ; and absolute transubstantiation ; towards which however he has gone as far, as he could possibly do, while he retains the name of a Protestant : but tho' that character obliged him, to keep as clear of Popery,

pery, as he was able, yet tradition, we see, has carried him to the very confines, and prepared him as it were to step into it, whenever a proper occasion should invite. For I could never consider these plans of primitive Christianity, when published by Protestants, in any other light, than as preliminary articles, offered to the Romish Church, as the ground for a treaty of peace and reconciliation, in which the few remaining points of difference might easily be accommodated. Which vain project of an union with *Rome*, has ever been the fond wish of all those zealots of our Church, who draw their religious principles from the source of primitive Antiquity.

I am a perfect stranger to the author of this piece, nor have any other knowledge of his character, than what has been signified to me by his writings, and the report of common fame. The warm expressions of piety and devotion, which run through his whole performance,

mance, oblige me to think him an honest man ; as I take every one to be, who governs himself by a virtuous principle, or believes, that he does so, tho' he be deceived in the choice, or the application of that principle. Fame also has informed me, that he lives up to the character, which his book points out to us ; practises what he professes ; and is an example of that discipline, which he prescribes to others : that he is a Protestant Priest ; yet a separatist from the communion of our Protestant Church ; disaffected to it's present constitution, and consequently, to the present government, on which it's security depends. This is the real character which his writings suggest : this, the natural course of his principles, when frankly avowed, and pushed to their full length. Principles, which, among Protestants, will ever produce the worst fruit, when they take root in the best minds ; will corrupt the purest heart ; make even the sincerity of men dangerous

gerous to society, and transform a pious, zealous Christian, into an enemy to his country

Yet these are the principles, which the *Chapmans, the Berrimans, the Stebbings* are so zealously asserting and recommending to this Protestant Kingdom. Dr. *Chapman*, as we shall see in the following Remarks, when driven by unanswerable testimonies, to give up the character of any ancient Father, as favorable to the Popish cause, takes refuge in *the collective body of them, and the consentient practice of the primitive Churches*, as the proper *armoury*, or bulwark of Protestantism : on which same foundation, this Catechism, which I have been considering, is professedly grounded. From this therefore every one may now learn, what a sort of Protestantism it is, which the authority of those ancients, and the zeal of these moderns would finally impose upon us : A Protestantism, compounded of *fanatical Enthusiasm, and Popish Superstition*; giving
 I itself

itself up to an implicit submission to Church authority; banishing every thing rational out of its doctrine and discipline; placing the principal service of God, in ritual observances, and Monkish devotions; and obliged to adopt, as *divine or Apostolic*, every whim and absurdity, which, through the credulity, bigotry, policy, or private interests of any leading Churchmen, had insinuated itself into the Christian worship, within the compass of the first four hundred years.

REMARKS

REMARKS

O N

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

UPON my first and hasty perusal of these *Anonymous Observations*, I could not help considering them as the work of some sly unbeliever, who under the mask of zeal for the honour of the Gospel, and a pretence of fears and jealousies, from the freedom of *the Introductory Discourse*, was craftily pointing out every topic and passage of it, which, by any art or force, could be strained to the advantage of the Infidel cause.

He begins early, to drop his suspicions, *that something bad lay at the bottom, which had excited the Author to this undertaking*; [a] and as he advances forward, takes occasion to declare, *that the Author must either renounce his argument or the Gospel*; [b] *that those, who believe*

[a] *Observat. p. 5.*

[b] *p. 18.*

~~The Fathers of the Second and third Centuries to~~
 be more credulous, than those of the fourth, may
 fancy the Apostles to have been more credulous
 than them all. [c] That if the world was so
 credulous, immediately after the Apostles, it will
 not be easy to comprehend, how it should have
 been much less so, in the Apostles' times; [d] that
 the Author's charge indeed stops with the Fathers,
 but that his arguments do not stop there; [e] for
 if the Fathers can be proved to have been forgetful
 of lies, the consequences may go a great way [f].

When I saw therefore an unknown writer,
 entering forwardly into a debate, to which he
 appeared to be an utter stranger; and treating
 the chief point of it, as a problem, which
 might possibly be true, yet representing it all
 the while, as ruinous to Christianity, what
 else could I so naturally think of him, as that
 he was some infidel in disguise, who was
 catching all opportunities of prompting the
 enemies of revelation, to lay hold on every
 thing, which could furnish matter of cavil or
 ridicule to the disadvantage of the Christian
 religion: for with whatever view he wrote, it

[c] p. 18. [d] p. 23. [e] 24. [f] 23.

is

is certain, that the obvious tendency of this performance is, to confirm people in Scepticism, and to suggest arguments for the defence of it. I have since indeed been informed, that he is of a character very different, from what I at first imagined; celebrated for his *polemic* writings, and eminently distinguished by his zeal and orthodox principles; and upon a stricter review of his work, I can discover many strokes, which seem to indicate a genuine of that sort; an eagerness to appear the first in the dispute, though he has nothing to offer in it, but the testimony of his zeal; the art of playing an hypothesis against fact, and of eluding by a distinction, what he cannot oppose by reasoning. Yet it puzzles me still, to consider, how such a veteran in controversy, and master of the *polemic* arts, can be so jejune and futile in the matter, and so injudicious and inconsistent in the management of his argument.

The professed design of his *Observations*, as it is signified in the very Title page, is, to *remove the prejudices of the Author of the Intro-*

doctory Dispute. But in a Discourse of that nature, formed in contradiction to opinions universally established, and religiously believed, to warn people *against the Author's prejudices*, and to attempt seriously to remove them, is in itself absurd and ridiculous. For in the present case, on which side can the weight of prejudices be supposed to lie? surely, the belief of nations, the testimony of ages; and the authority of fifteen Centuries, are the strongest prejudices, which can possibly be conceived, in favor of any controverted facts; and no contradiction can be offered to them, but under all the disadvantage and inequality, which any influence of that sort can create. If our Observer therefore had really desired, to have this question fairly examined, it should have been his first care, to remove these capital prejudices out of the way, or at least, to moderate the force of them, by informing his readers, that if the practice and example of past ages, of what duration soever, had been thought of weight enough to over-rule all other evidence; no improvement of science, or reformation in religion, nor even Christianity itself could ever

I

ever

ever have made it's way into the world : but instead of this, the whole purpose of his book is, not to remove, but to strengthen old prejudices, and inculcate new ones in every page, against the design, the subject, and the whole composition of *the Introductory Discourse*.

He declares it to be a work, *of no use or significance to us, either as Christians or Protestants*; [g] that it *advances nothing towards the general conclusion, which it aims at, but leaves the question just as it found it*; [h] that it *quarrels with the whole stream of Christian writers, and that a candid man would not have offered such a charge to the public, without producing his evidence at the same time*; [i] that *the Fathers are in possession, and have a right to keep it, till their title be disproved*. [k] All which declarations are so many contradictions to his pretence of removing prejudices. For it is not possible, that a *Discourse of no significance, advancing nothing, but leaving things just as it found them*, should be capable of infusing any thing prejudicial to any cause whatsoever. Yet what is still more remarkable, he affirms *the twelve last pages of it*

[g] p. 5, 25. [h] p. 24. [i] p. 6. [k] p. 25.

is: be: nothing else, but one thorough impertinency, from the beginning to the end: [4] This indeed is the true old way of removing prejudices, by removing whole creatures at once; and shows, what our Observator would be at; this filitary method, now practised so successfully abroad, of an *Index expurgatorius*, or what was used also formerly with equal success, at home, an *Imprimatur* by the Chaplains of our Bishops. But what is it after all, which makes those pages so completely impertinent and offensive to him? Why, they contain an *harangue*, he says, on the *Scriptures being the rule of faith*; and a charge upon the present Clergy, of carrying the credit of Ecclesiastic Authority to an height, which tends to throw us again into the hands of the *Rough Church*. Yet if [4] an *harangue* be true, it can never be impertinent, in a Protestant country; especially at a time, when Popery is allowed to be gaining ground upon us. And as to the charge, as he calls it, upon the present Clergy, as if it included the whole body of them; it is the exaggeration only of a polemic writer; for though Dr. M.,

the Author of that Discourse, charges the Clergy in general, with paying a greater deference to the Authority of the Fathers, than is due, and much more, than is paid to it by any other Protestant Church; yet in the passage here referred to, where he is speaking of principles, *now carried to a length, which must needs alarm all serious Protestants*, he cannot be understood to be charging any other part, or persons of the Clergy, but those particular *Defenders of the primitive Monks and their miracles*, whose names he often mentions, and whose principles he particularly exposes, through that whole Discourse, as dangerous to the Protestant cause: which charge he will always be ready to make good, against all, who assert, and all who encourage and reward the Assertors of such principles.

The argument of the Introductory Discourse, is formed upon a supposition of *the truth of the miracles of Christ and the Apostles*, as they stand recorded in the New Testament, and sets forth the proper distinction between them, and the miracles of the succeeding ages, in order to shew, that whatever

be the success of that work, the credit of the Gospel cannot be affected by it. In this our Observer perfectly agrees with Dr. M——n, and expressly declares, in different parts of his book, *that, if not so much as one true miracle could be found after the days of the Apostles, the foundations of Christianity would be equally secure.* [m] Yet notwithstanding these declarations, we find him perpetually insinuating, that the very attempt to prove, what when actually proved, he affirms, to be of no significance, is dangerous to the Authority of the Gospel, and sufficient to alarm all good Christians with the apprehensions of its consequences.

In the same manner, all the other Advocates of the primitive miracles, in the midst of their zeal to assert their authority, take care to distinguish the Apostolic miracles, as established on much clearer evidence and a firmer foundation. Thus Dr. Berriman, speaking of a particular miracle of the fifth Century, affirms, *that it cannot be discredited, without rejecting all accounts of miracles, except those of the Scrip-*

[m] p. 30.

tures :

tures : [n] intimating by that exception, that the Scriptural miracles would stand, though all the rest were overthrown. Yet no sooner does Dr. M—— attempt to overthrow them, than we hear these very men crying out with one voice, that *he is overthrowing Christianity itself, and whatever his intention may be, that he will carry us of course, either into Popery or Scepticism.* [o] Hence we may observe, how easily spleen and prejudice can over-rule the reason and even conviction of these writers, and how the zeal, which they so warmly express in the present cause, cannot be a zeal for the Gospel, which they declare to be unconcerned in it, but for some particular opinions and systems, which have been engrafted upon it at different times, for the more commodious support of the interests, or ease of the leading Churchmen.

Again, it is affirmed in the *Introductory Discourse*, “ that the miracles of the fourth Century were universally the effects of fraud and imposture ; which yet all the principal

[n] See Serm. at Lady Moyer's lecture, p. 327.

[o] See Def. of Dr. C—n's Charge, p. 46.

" Fathers of that age, partly through weak cred-
 " dulity, and partly through reasons of policy;
 " made it their business, to propagate, in favor
 " of certain rites and doctrines, which they
 " were desirous to establish : that considering
 " the characters of those Fathers, it was rea-
 " sonable to think, that they either forged
 " those miracles themselves, or knew them to
 " be forged by others ; or, if that should not
 " be granted, it was certain at least, that they
 " were so far deluded by other people's fan-
 " geries, as to take them for real miracles :
 " and let the Advocates of those Fathers chuse
 " which of those alternatives they pleased, it
 " would have the same force towards evincing
 " Dr. M.—'s general conclusion," *that we*
have no sufficient ground to believe upon their
authority, that any miraculous powers were sub-
sisting in the Church in that age.

This state of the case is clear and consistent.
 Let us see then, how the Observer has contri-
 bued to perplex it. In the 1st place, he is
 angry with Dr. M—, for charging those mi-
 racles to *fraud and imposture*, when it was as
 easy to ascribe them to *superstition and credulity* :

is every man a knave or cheat; says he, who believes, that there is virtue in an amulet or charm? [p] By this easy way of putting the question, one would imagine the dispute to have turned only, on the primitive method of curing the cramp, or the tooth-ach. But when positive testimonies have been produced from the most venerable of the Fathers, declaring; that *the dead had been raised to life, and the blind restored to sight; by touching the reliques of some reputed Saint, or by sending their cloaths onely to be touched by them; will the virtue of an amulet be sufficient to account for the reality of such facts, or the belief of that virtue, to justify the integrity of such witnesses?* but on this article he asks, *how Dr. M— comes to know, that the Fathers did not believe the miracles, which they themselves have recorded?* [q] The answer is obvious, that the nature of the things attested, and the characters of the persons attesting must convince every reasonable man; that they could not believe them. And here it is curious to observe, how the state of the controversy is of a sudden reversed: for the

[p] Observat. p. 13.

[q] p. 14.

Observer, whose chief quarrel with Dr. M— is, for his injurious opinion and treatment of the ancient Fathers, now takes the opposite side, and quarrels with him, for thinking more highly of them, than he himself does. Dr. M— conceives so good an opinion of their understanding, as to think it impossible, that they should not discover the palpable forgery of the absurd stories, which they relate; whereas the Observer takes them, to have been so grossly ignorant and credulous, that they might probably believe them.

Since he is so fond then of this hypothesis of their *credulity*, and thinks it, the onely way of saving the more valuable character of their integrity, it will be proper to consider the nature and extent of it a little more precisely, by applying it to a particular fact or two, on which it is supposed to have been exercised: which I shall extract again from St. *Jerom*, as being of all the Ancients, the most generally esteemed for his learning and judgement by the Divines of these days.

This Father, in his life of *St. Hilarion the Monk*, among many other monstrous stories, relates;

relates ; “ how that holy man happening to
 “ travel into *Dalmatia*, was there presently
 “ informed, that a terrible Dragon was laying
 “ waste the whole province, of so enormous
 “ a size and strength, that he could suck
 “ up into his mouth, by the force of his
 “ breath, whole oxen and sheep, together with
 “ the herdsmen also and shepherds, and swal-
 “ low them down at once. *Hilarion* therefore,
 “ being implored by the inhabitants of the
 “ country, to deliver them from this monster,
 “ ordered a pile of wood to be prepared, and
 “ having put up his prayers to Christ, called
 “ out the Dragon and commanded it to ascend
 “ the pile, which being done accordingly, he
 “ set fire to the wood, and so the beast was
 “ burnt alive, in the sight of all the people [r].

The same Father, in his Life also of an
 Hermit, named *Paul*, tells this story, “ that
 “ when *St. Antony*, another Hermit, was tra-
 “ velling through the deserts of *Egypt*, to seek
 “ out *Paul*, whom he was ordered to visit by
 “ a divine revelation, he met with a *Centaur*
 “ upon the road, and being amazed at the
 [r] Hieron. Op. Tom. 4. par. 2. p. 87.

“ figure

" figure of so strange a creature; and having
 " armed himself with the sign of the Cross,
 " he demanded of the beast, in what part of
 " the desert, the Servant of God resided : to
 " which the *Centaur* made some answer, in
 " a strange and horrible tone of voice, and
 " with gestures of great civility, pointed out
 " the way to him at the same time, by
 " stretching out his right hand, and then ran
 " swiftly away." Upon which, *Jerom* leaves
 it as a problem, to the consideration of the
 reader. *Whether the Devil assumed that shape,*
to affright the holy man, or the Deserts, fruitfull
of monsters, produced that species also of animals.
 But be that as it will, " *Antony* had not gone
 " many steps farther, wondering within him-
 " self, at what he had just seen, before he
 " espied a *Saty*r approaching towards him, or
 " a little man, with Goat's feet; a crooked
 " nose, and a forehead armed with horns,
 " who, in token of peace, offered him the
 " fruit of the palm tree, and being asked pre-
 " sently by *Antony*, what he was, gave this
 " answer ; I am a mortal, and one of those
 " inhabitants of the Desert, whom the deluded

Gentiles worship, under the names of *Fanis*,
 “ *Satyr*s and *Incubi*; and am now deputed, as
 “ an Ambassador from our whole tribe, to beg
 “ your prayers and intercession for us; to our
 “ common Lord and master, whom we know,
 “ to have been sent for the salvation of the
 “ whole world” — to which story *Jerom* adds
 this remark; “ that no man need to be scru-
 “ pulous about the truth of it, because it was
 “ confirmed to the whole world, in the time
 “ of *Constantin*, when a little man, of the
 “ same species, was brought alive to *Alexan-*
 “ *dria*, and afforded a remarkable spectacle to
 “ the whole people [3].”

Now it is allowed by all, that *St. Jerom* was
 a man of great parts and knowledge: *Dr.*
Chapman declares, that he understood the nature
 of piety and superstition, as well as any man
 living: and were he now alive, would soon do
 justice to himself and his brethren by his pen, and
 lash his revilers into a little more gravity and
 civility [1]. If then, notwithstanding the
 authority of so great a man, *Dr. M*— finds

[3] *Ibid.* p. 70, 71.

[1] See *Miscell. Tracts*, p. 182.
 and *Det. of his Charge*, p. 38.

himself

himself convinced from the very nature of these stories, that they are all utterly fabulous, he must be thought to judge reasonably, in believing, that *St. Jerom*, (the superiority of whose judgement and learning he freely acknowledges) could not fail of being convinced of it too. But if our *Observer* has any scruples still on this head, and will insist, that *Jerom* might actually believe them ; I am content to debate the matter with him on his own terms, and refer the whole question to this single issue ; *whether men so grossly credulous and superstitious can be authentic witnesses of miracles, which tend to confirm their particular interests, or prejudices, or favorite opinions?*

In the mean while, I find it necessary, to take notice of a distinction or two, of which he makes great use, and in which his chief strength lies ; for unless we can clear ourselves of these, we may spare the pains of disputing with him, since by their help, he can evade the conclusion, though he allows all the premises. For example, it is affirmed in the *Introductory Discourse*, that the *Fathers themselves*, when they are disposed to speak truth, have not
scrupled

scrupled to confess, that miracles were actually ceased in the fourth Century, because the Church stood no longer in need of them [u]. The Observer himself allows, *that there are many such passages in those Fathers [x].* Yet the same Fathers, on other occasions, confidently affirm; and sometimes, from their own knowledge, that perpetual miracles were still wrought in the same age, by *reliques, sacred oil, holy water, the sign of the Cross, and the sacramental bread.* Now from passages, so seemingly opposite and contradictory, a plain man would naturally conclude, that those Fathers were inconsistent with themselves, and telling us consequently what was false, either on the one side, or the other. But such an imagination must not be entertained; it seems, of persons so holy and venerable; who were *too good*, as Dr. Chapman declares, *to offer at any quirks or illusions [y]:* of which, this Observer will presently convince us, and solve the difficulty. For having discovered, that the miracles, which are recorded by *St. Austin*, are all said to have been

[u] See Disc. p. 36.

[*] Observ. p. 9. See note.

[y] Miscel. Tracts, p. 26.

wrought, not by the ministry of living men, extraordinarily appointed, as in the Apostles days, but either by the Sacraments, or by prayer, or the memories of the Martyrs, he makes this reflection upon it, that "if the Author of the
 " *Introductory Discourse* would have understood those passages of the Fathers, as they
 " ought to be understood, with this distinction, he would have spared his unmannerly
 " reflection. Because it might be true, that
 " miracles were then wrought by the Sacraments,
 " though it was not true, that any were then
 " wrought by the ministry of living men, as in
 " the days of the Apostles [z]."

These polemic writers, if they can serve a present turn, and get rid of some incidental difficulty in a debate, by any quibble of this sort, seldom look forward, or consider, what effect it may have on the main question, or on Christianity itself. The present distinction serves to clear the Fathers from the charge of inconsistency; and so far it will be applauded by all the admirers of primitive antiquity; but it has not yet done half its work; for unless

[z] *Observ. p. 9. note.*

the

the reason, assigned by those Fathers, for *the cessation of miracles*, can be distinguished also away, they must be understood to be speaking of an *universal cessation*, because, *the Church*, as they tell us, *stood no longer in need of them*. But here indeed, our Observer's distinction will do most notable service : for though the religion of the Gospel, after it had gained an establishment in the world, stood no longer in need of miracles, wrought *by the ministry of living men*, as in the days of the Apostles, which were necessary onely, to the first plantation of it, yet the new rites and doctrines engrafted upon that *Gospel-religion*, with regard to *the Sacraments*, *the reliques of Saints*, and *Monks*, &c. required new miracles of a different kind, to facilitate the establishment also of these : and since living men were no longer indued with those extraordinary gifts, the inanimate part of the creation was now called up in judgement against the contemners of these rites ; and the *rotten bones and dust of the Martyrs* ; or a *rag of their old cloaths* ; a *drop of water*, or *oil* ; a *bit of bread* ; the *chip of an old Cross*, or the *figure of a new one* ; in short,

every thing, which had been touched by a Saint, or consecrated by a Priest, began to work miracles, and continues to do so, in the same manner, from that time to this, through four parts in five, of the whole Christian world.

Thus we see, what clear work our Observer's distinction would make in the present question. But there is one unhappy circumstance belonging to it, which he is not perhaps aware of, or willing at least to conceal, that it is contrary to fact, and the testimony of those very Fathers, in whose defence he now urges it. For though they speak much more frequently of miracles wrought by *reliques*, and the *Sacraments*, &c. than of any other kind, yet they speak likewise of several, which they attest to be wrought by *holy Monks*, *then living*; by the credit of which, they chiefly established the Monkish order, though vile and contemptible in the judgement of the wiser and better sort, of the Christian laity in those very days.

Again, Dr. M—— lays it down for a maxim, in the *Introductory Discourse*, that
whenever

whenever any sacred rite becomes the instrument of real miracles, we ought to consider that rite, as confirmed by divine approbation : whence he infers, that if we admit the miracles of the fourth Century, we must admit the rites, which those miracles confirmed, and those Fathers practised. But here again, the Observer stops us short with a distinction, without which, he says, that reasoning cannot be true [a]. The distinction is this ; “ that miracles wrought
 “ by the reliques of the Martyrs, or by the
 “ Sacraments, or by holy Monks, cannot reasonably be interpreted to authorise any
 “ superstitious practice or doctrine, which
 “ prevailed in those times, with regard to
 “ reliques, or the Sacrament, or Monkery, unless there be some circumstance in them,
 “ which specifies such an interpretation ; for
 “ otherwise they must be understood onely,
 “ to confirm that religion of the Gospel, for
 “ which those Martyrs died, and which those
 “ Monks professed.” In the support of which distinction, he spends two or three pages, with some little subtilty and refinement, but

[a] Observ. p. 8, 10.

not a grain of sense in them ; and serving only to illustrate his own ignorance of the times, and the subject too, of which he is talking.

For instance ; it was the principal devotion of the fourth Century, in all cases of sickness or distress, *to fly to the tombs of the Martyrs* ; grounded on a general persuasion, that by prostrating themselves *before their reliques, and especially by touching them*, they should find present cure and relief : and great numbers are affirmed by the Fathers, to have been cured in this manner of all sorts of diseases, and several, *to have been raised even from the dead*. Now let him distinguish here, as much as he pleases, it is certain, from the experience of all ages, that the attestation and belief of such miraculous cures never had any other effect, or were understood to have any other meaning, than to imprint an opinion of *a divine virtue in the reliques*, and consequently, to authorise *the worship*, which was paid to them : which began to be paid, from the very moment, in which they first began to work miracles, and was soon carried to that extravagance, with which

we see it practised at this day, in the Church of Rome.

The Observator however insists, *that if God thinks fit, to work a cure by dead men's bones, it will not follow, that dead men, or their bones ought to be worshipped* [b]. But the fact is, that the worship of them did immediately follow, and has ever since followed, and must for ever follow the belief of such cures, to the utter confutation of his silly hypothesis. For in order to defend the authority of the Fathers, he first supposes it true, that miracles were really wrought by *dead men's bones*; and then, in contradiction to their authority, is forced to deny the use and end, for which the same Fathers declare them to have been wrought, and which, by the credit of those pretended miracles, gained an establishment through the whole Christian world: whereas the end, for which they were wrought, and the effect, which they have constantly produced, ought to have convinced him, and every other Protestant, that they were all mere fictions.

[b] Observ. p. 10.

For it is certain, though he does not seem to know it, that all the miracles of this kind, were suspected and contemned, from the very beginning, by the more discreet and honest part of the Clergy, who argued, “ that signs and
 “ wonders were proper indeed, for the conversion of Heathens and unbelievers, whose
 “ prejudices were too strong, to be over-ruled by the cool arguments of reason ; but that
 “ miracles wrought by *reliques*, within the Church and among the faithfull, were of no
 “ use to the advancement of the Gospel, but tended to corrupt and debase it, by the introduction of paganish superstitions into the
 “ Christian worship.” [c] Which controversy began with the first relique-worship of those primitive ages, in the same manner, as it is carried on at this day between the Protestants and Papists, yet the Observator supposes, that God might be working miracles all the while, by *dead men’s bones*, without intending, that they should give any sanction to a superstitious worship, intirely grounded upon the belief, that his approbation was signified by those very miracles.

[c] Vid. Hieron. Op. T. 4. par. 2. p. 285.

But

But he observes, " that the Author of *the*
" Introductory Discourse, would have had a bet-
" ter pretence for asserting, that we must either
" accept the doctrines, or reject the miracles of
" those ages, if he could produce any Monk
" or other person, who appealed expressly to
" miracles, in confirmation of an usage, not
" warranted by Scripture, and to be received as
" of divine appointment." [d] If he had been
 acquainted with Ecclesiastic Antiquity, he could
 not be at a loss for examples of that sort; the
 very *Discourse*, which he pretends to confute,
 affords a remarkable one, in the controversy
 between *Vigilantius*, who protested against *the*
religious honors paid to the bones and dust of the
Martyrs, and *St. Jerom*, who defended them:
answer me, says *Jerom*, *how it comes to pass, that*
in this vile dust and ashes, there is so great a ma-
nifestation of signs and wonders. [e] For what
 is this, but a direct appeal to a divine interpo-
 sition, in favor of *that relique-worship*, which
 the *primitive Protestant* was condemning, and
 the *primitive Father* defending?

[d] Obs. p. 9.

[e] Hieron. ibid.

Having

Having now entertained us with all the little cavils, which occurred to him on this article, he proceeds to confirm them, by the authority of *Dr. Claget*, whose *determination*, as he calls it, on this very argument, he has transcribed at length in two paragraphs. And lest we should wonder, why the opinion of that ingenious writer should be introduced under the pompous title, of a *determination*, he refers us, for the reason of it, to the bottom of the page [f]; where we are told, *that he was once the Preacher of Gray's Inn*, as if nothing but what is decisive could be delivered from that pulpit.

Let us see then, what it is, that *Dr. Claget* has determined on this question. He declares in the first place, *that the miracles of the 4th century are urged by the Romanists, as an invincible argument, of God's approving the honor given to the Saints and reliques of that age.* But when he attempts to confute that invincible argument, upon the common hypothesis, of the truth of those miracles, he does nothing more, than what our *Observer* has been doing, and all others must do in the same case, trifle, and

[f] *Observ.* p. 11th.

shuffle,

shuffle, and labor for pitifull distinctions, which betray a consciousness of acting against his judgement, and oblige him after all, to signify, that he did not believe those miracles to be true. But what is more remarkable; in the single passage of the two paragraphs, here transcribed, in which *Dr. Claget* can be said to determine any thing at all, he determines in favor of *Dr. M--n's* argument, and declares the same opinion, with respect to the primitive miracles, which is declared in the *Introductory Discourse*, as it is expressed by him in the following words; *And if I should say, that they, who can be content with the old religion, [of the scriptures,] may and ought to be content with the old miracles, [of the scriptures], I should say no other thing, but what I could justify [g].*

But *Dr. Claget*, as the *Observer* tells us, *imputes the false miracles of the 4th century to credulity; [b] whereas Dr. M--n charges them to fraud and imposture, yet sometimes, when he is in better mood, ascribes them also himself to credulity. Whence he takes occasion to censure him, for talking inconsistently, and at random, and wa-*

[g] P. 12.

[b] P. 13.

rying

rying his charge, as his humour varies. [i] Which silly blunder runs thro' his whole performance, and shews how little he has thought upon his subject, since this obvious reflection has never once occurred to him, "that where-ever false
 " miracles have obtained a general credit, there
 " *fraud and credulity* must both have been
 " jointly employed in producing that effect;
 " *fraud* in the contrivance, and *credulity* in the
 " reception of them; and if either of these can
 " be justly charged upon the Fathers, that it
 " will have the same force, with respect to the
 " argument of the *Introductory Discourse*."

There is one method of reasoning, peculiar to this Observator, and which I have rarely met with any where else; that in the want of arguments, he can form them at pleasure, even from his own ignorance; the instances of which, he frequently urges, as so many objections to the *Introductory Discourse*. *I cannot see this; do not understand that; am not satisfied, that his account is fair; know no such thing; think the Gentleman mistaken;* are common objections with him. [k] And tho' in other wri-

[i] P. 15, 33,

[k] P. 5, 7, 18, 20, 26.

ters,

ters, a confession of ignorance generally carries some appearance of modesty, yet in this, it seems to flow from that sort of pride, which cannot allow any man, to know more of any subject than himself, or any thing to be true, of which he can be ignorant.

He says, "that he knows no book, not
 " Canonical, which passed upon all the Fa-
 " thers, as genuin and divine, thro' several suc-
 " cessive ages: nor does it follow, that because
 " some Fathers cited spurious pieces, therefore
 " they were held in the same rank with the
 " scriptures." [1] To which it will be a suffi-
 cient answer for the present, that, in the age
 immediately succeeding to that of the Apostles,
 certain writings were forged by some of *the*
ablest and most learned of the Christians, under the
 title of *Sibylline books or oracles*, which were
 falsely ascribed to the ancient *Sibyl*, and pre-
 tended to foretell and describe prophetically, all
 the principal acts and circumstances of our Sa-
 viour's life. Which books were cited by all the
 Fathers, and in all ages, from *Justin Martyr's*
 time down to the Reformation, as genuin, and

[1] P. 21.

inspired

inspired by God, in the same manner, as *the prophetic books of the Old Testament*; and particularly, in the 2d century, that *Clemens of Alexandria*, one of the most learned and critical of all the Fathers, appeals to their authority as divine, and confirms it by the express testimonies of *St. Peter and St. Paul*, which he draws likewise, from certain spurious books, which were current in that age, and believed to be the genuine writings of those Apostles.

But here again, he throws in one of his puzzling questions, and asks; “ what does the author of the *Discourse* know of the abilities, learning, or religion of those primitive forgers of books, whom he calls the ablest and most learned of the Christians?” [m.] To which I may readily answer, that he knows nothing more, than what every man of sense may know, as well as he, from the very nature of the thing; that books, written upon the plan, and for the defence of the Gospel, full of piety and Christian principles, at a time, when that religion was persecuted by all the powers on earth, must needs have been

[m.] P. 22.

written

written by Christians; and being so artfully written, and so highly esteemed, as to pass upon the most judicious, for divine or apostolic compositions, they must have been written also, by the *ablest and most learned* of the Christians, at a time, when the whole body of them was generally reproach'd for their rusticity and want of learning.

He condescends indeed to grant, tho' with some caution, and for *argument's sake*, as he says, *that the Fathers made use, both of spurious books, and forged miracles:* from which he draws this inference; "that as together with
 " those spurious books, they used some, which
 " were genuin, so it is natural to suppose, that
 " among their false miracles there might be
 " some also, which were real: and then asks,
 " how this can help to support the general
 " conclusion, that *no miracles were wrought in*
 " *those ages.*" [n] But from a joint use of *spurious and genuin books*, to infer a joint use also of *spurious and genuin miracles*, is weak and fallacious; because there is no analogy between the two cases: for the use of books, whether spu-

[n] P. 22.

I

rious

rious or genuin, depends intirely on man ; whereas in the use of miracles, as far as any of them are true, God himself must also be concerned. When the leaders therefore of a Church, either thro' craft or credulity, are imposing false miracles upon the people ; to suppose, that God would become a party, and throw in a true miracle now and then, to give them credit, is not onely an absurd, but impious supposition. But should I allow, that the detection of spurious books and false miracles, does not necessarily prove, that there were no true miracles in the same age, and will not consequently support Dr. M—'s general conclusion ; yet the Observer's quæstion is certainly impertinent, because he might have seen, from *the Introductory Discourse*, that the proof of those forgeries was not intended, *to support that conclusion*, but onely to strengthen the probability of it, in concert with 20 others, which more directly confirm it. The whole purpose, for which it is urged, is granted by himself, and must be allowed by every body else, that those, who *forged books*, would, for the same cause, *forged miracles* too, if there was an occasion for them ; and that the

frequent use of such forgeries, which is allowed to have been made by the principal Fathers, must increase the suspicion, that all the miracles, which they attest, were of the same kind.

Among many other censures upon the Author of *the Introductory Discourse*, he charges him, “ with acting disingenuously, in publishing it, without sending his larger work abroad, at the same time, and scattering his surmises, before the evidence is heard. Which has the appearance, he says, of an experiment rather, to try the sense of the public, than of confidence in the justice of his cause.” [o]

And here indeed, I readily agree with him, that, by the separate publication of *that Discourse*, the Author of it seems to intimate some distrust of himself, and a temper totally different from that confidence, with which the Observer rushes into a controversy, without any previous acquaintance with it: who yet in this very cause, and before the evidence, as he complains, is heard, makes no scruple to pronounce sentence, and like a worthy Ecclesiastic Judge, to dismiss it at once, as frivolous and vexatious.

[o] Observ. p. 24.

D

But

But whatever judgement he may think fit to declare on the subject of the *Introductory Discourse*; Dr. M--n knows it to be important, and treats it as such; yet is sensible, that he stands single in the defence of it, and aware of the censures, which it may draw upon him from the bigotted, the interested and the ambitious part of the Clergy; from some, who possess the chief preferments of the Church, and from all the numerous tribe, who court them. He remembers, what clamors and injurious suspicions, the freedom of his writings has formerly drawn upon him from that same sort of men; who treat him as an enemy, not onely to the present establishment of our Church, but to religion itself: yet conscious of his integrity, and that his principles tend to fix them both on a more secure foundation, he writes with no other view, than to unite all reasonable Protestants the more firmly in their defence; and to guard our people, as well from *Papish superstition*, as *fanatical enthusiasm*; both of them equally dangerous to the peace of these Kingdoms, and both making advances upon us at this very time from different quarters indeed, and

and parties of men, but from the same source and pattern of primitive antiquity.

In these circumstances, persuaded, that he was doing service, yet decried, as if he were doing mischief to Christianity, how could he act with more candor or deference to the public authority, than by sending his scheme abroad in this plain and naked form; that if any one of superior judgement and knowledge of Antiquity, should happen to convince him, either of the falsehood or iniquity of it, he might withdraw it in time, before he had engaged himself too forwardly in it, or warmed himself and his readers too much, to judge impartially of the particular proofs, which may be alledged in confirmation of it. But if it be found after all, to contain nothing either false or iniquitous, nor to threaten any hurt to any thing, but to groundless systems, and superstitious opinions, which have no other claim to be retained, but that they have long been established, and are of no other use, but to lull us on in a slothfull ignorance and implicit credulity, or to gratify the indolence of some leading Churchmen, who think, that nothing can want a change, which

contributes to their repose. If this, I say, should be the case, and no material objection be offered, but that perpetual obstacle of all reformation, *an affected dread of improbable consequences, and the danger of disturbing settlements*, he will not be driven by any discouragement, which he may meet with, from pursuing his destined task of publishing his free thoughts on all questions, and especially on those which relate to religion, as far as he believes them to be true, and of benefit also to the public.

But to return to our Observator, who begs our patience for one word more, concerning the connection between the argument of *the Introductory Discourse*, and our controversy with the *Church of Rome*: with respect to which, it is affirmed in that Discourse, *that by admitting the miracles of the primitive ages, we shall be entangled in a series of difficulties, whence we can never fairly extricate ourselves, without allowing the same miraculous powers even to the present age*. Here again he asks, *what are these difficulties which the Gentleman is so afraid of?* declares, *that he sees none; and that we may surely be justified in admitting the miracles of the*

2d

2d and 3d centuries, without being obliged to receive the *Popish legends*. [p] But by what principle or distinction may we be so sure of it? For even his *polemic genius* has not been able to suggest any: and it is certain, that every other Protestant, who has taken the most pains, towards searching this matter to the bottom, has found those pains perpetually frustrated by insuperable difficulties. In condescension therefore to his confessed ignorance, I shall endeavour to lay the quæstion before him in such a light, as may inable him to see some of it's difficulties, if his blindness be not incurable.

It is allowed by all Christians, that the miraculous gifts, which are mentioned in the Gospel, continued in the Church, thro' the Apostolic age: and it is affirmed by the Fathers and Church-Historians, that they subsisted still in the same manner, after the days of the Apostles, and were openly exerted in every succeeding age, down even to the present: which is now the prevailing opinion, in much the greatest part of the Christian world; and the chief argument, by which *the superstitious rites and*

[p] Obf. p. 26.

D 3

doctrines

doctrines of the Romish Church are at this day supported.

The Protestants on the other hand, in contradiction to the Romanists, universally affirm, that *the miraculous gifts of the Apostolic days have long since utterly ceased* in the Christian Church, but cannot agree among themselves, about the time, when the cessation of them commenced, nor have been able to assign any probable criterion, by which we may declare them, to have proceeded thus far, and no farther: yet the Observer sees no difficulty in the case, and cannot conceive wherein it lies.

Many of the Protestants indeed, as it is said in *the Introductory Discourse*, take the conversion of the Roman Empire to have been the æra, in which true miracles ceased. But this is a mere arbitrary hypothesis, grounded neither on History, nor any solid reason; because miracles are said to have been wrought still, after that period, as freely as before it, and in some cases attested by the same witnesses; who, by this hypothesis, must be held worthy of all credit before that revolution, yet unworthy of any, immediately after it. But what is still of more difficult

difficult digestion; this same hypothesis, if admitted to be true, gives the lie at once to all the illustrious Fathers of the 4th Century, *St. Epiphanius, St. Basil, St. Athanasius, St. Jerom, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, &c.* persons the most highly revered and Sainted by the Catholic Church, for their piety, probity, zeal, and services to the Christian religion: who have all severally recorded and affirmed great numbers of miracles, to have been wrought in their times, many years after the conversion of the Roman Empire.

If we trace the succession of miracles still lower, we shall find *Dr. Chapman* defending some even of the 5th century; the most extravagant perhaps, that any history has recorded; yet declaring, *that we cannot reject them, without shaking the credit of all human testimony, and believing nothing but what we see and feel and know ourselves.* [q] And his fellow-laborer, *Dr. Berriman*, makes the same declaration, in favor of another miracle, in the end of the same century, *which cannot be discredited, he says, without shaking the faith of*

[q] *Miscel. Tracts, p. 167.*

History, and rejecting all accounts of miracles, besides those of the Scriptures. [r]

Thus according to the judgement of these two Protestant Divines, distinguished by their eminent zeal for primitive antiquity, miracles were still subsisting in the Church, even after it was plunged into the depths of Popery; yet our Observator sees no difficulty. He will say perhaps, that wherever we find any superstitious rites established, or incredible facts affirmed, by a pretence of miracles, there we ought to distinguish and reject such miracles. But this is to beg the question, not to prove it; and is too precarious a way of reasoning to give any satisfaction; because what seems incredible to one, may seem credible to another: and Dr. Berriman, speaking of *the miracles of the 6th century*, has over-ruled every plea of that kind, by declaring; *that we have no reason, to dispute the truth of the facts, on account of the miraculousness, or natural incredibility of them, unless it can be proved, as it certainly cannot be, that miracles were ceased in that age.* [s]

[r] Sermon at Lady Moyer's Lect. p. 327. [s] Ibid. 356.

Thus

Thus which way soever we turn ourselves, we shall be entangled only the more, by our struggling. If we urge the incredibility of the facts related in these later ages; these Advocates tell us presently, that the same objection bears as strongly against the earlier ages, but that the authority of the witnesses will overrule it in both; if we dispute the veracity of the later witnesses, they affirm them to be full as credible, as the more ancient, and their evidence as convincing, as human testimony can possibly be. So that no other part is left, but either, to reject all miracles, except those of the Scriptures, agreeably to the genuin interests and principles of Protestants; or else, to admit them all, agreeably to the practice and policy of the Romanists. For what Dr. *Berriman* has declared, concerning *the miracles of the 6th century*, may as justly be applied to the *miracles of the 16th*; that there is no reason to dispute the truth of them, unless it can be proved, *that miracles were then ceased*: for on this proof alone, the strength and security of the Protestant cause chiefly depend.

The

The Observator however proceeds to acquaint us, that our Reformers *thought it to their purpose, to challenge as much of antiquity to themselves, as they could find authorities to justify, in the ancient Fathers.* [1] And I may add; that they sometimes challenged more of it, than truly belonged to them, or was serviceable to their

[1] Obs. p. 28. But the Observator takes occasion in this place, to censure the Author of the Discourse, *for citing passages from Dr. Waterland unfairly, which, if rightly quoted, would bear directly against him,* [p. 28. Note †.] Yet all, which that Author has so cited, is given in Dr. Waterland's own words, without any mixture or paraphrase, and what is more to the purpose, the passage here particularly referred to, is an intire paragraph, in which Dr. Waterland professes, to have collected *the sum, of what he had been endeavouring to prove,* in the whole foregoing treatise: and it is not possible, that any man's sentiments can be more fairly represented, than in those very words, to which he himself refers us, for the substance of them: and if that Dr. has happened to talk differently in different parts of his writings, it certainly proves nothing else but his own inconsistency. For I may venture to affirm of the Author of the *Introductory Discourse*, what I shall say without scruple of myself, that I have never read all Dr. Waterland's works, nor any of them perhaps, quire through, but have ever valued my time too much, to spend it in such reading; and am content to rank myself among those *superficial Dunces*, whom Dr. Chapman so highly contemns, for satisfying themselves, in the choice of their books, *with a few of the most eminent and elegant, in each class.* See his Charge, p. 27.

cause.

cause. But these Reformers, who dealt so much with antiquity, were generally of that sort, who acted under the direction of the Court, and were forced on that account, to act by political as well as Christian principles: whereas the greater part of the reforming Divines, as well in our own, as in foreign countries, who were not cramped by any influence of that kind, but wrote purely, for the defence of Protestantism against Popery, frankly rejected and threw out of their Scheme, all the traditions and doctrines, and whole authority of the primitive Fathers, as making no part of their religion, nor serving to any good purpose in it; of which we have clear proofs in many of their writings still extant.

The Observator having now served his chief purpose, of displaying his *polemic* talents, and shewn, to what length he could hold up the debate, is content at last, to give up the main point, which he had seemingly been contending for, and to grant the whole, of what the Author of *the Introductory Discourse* can be concerned about. For he declares, " that when
" the Apostles died the whole system of faith
" was

“ was sealed up and complete : and as no other,
 “ faith was afterwards to be admitted, so, if no
 “ miracles had afterwards been wrought, the
 “ foundation would have been equally secure,
 “ since the old miracles are sufficient for the old
 “ doctrines.” [u] And in another place he
 adds these words; “ say the worst you can say,
 “ (and more, I am persuaded, than will ever be
 “ proved to be true) that there is not so much
 “ as one miracle upon record, since the days of
 “ the Apostles, that is sufficiently attested :
 “ what has Christianity to do with this ? No-
 “ thing. For Christianity stands not upon
 “ the new miracles, but upon the old.” [w]
 But tho’ this be true ; I must put him how-
 ever in mind of what he ought to have intima-
 ted at the same time, that it is true onely, with
 regard to that Christianity, which is professed
 by Protestants ; whereas *Popish Christianity*,
 which possesses much the largest share of the
 Christian world, would be undone at once, if
 the authority of the primitive Fathers and pri-
 mitive miracles should be rejected in common
 by all Christians.

[u] Obf. p. 30.

[w] P. 32.

The summ then of all, which our Observer has affirmed on this quæstion, with any sense or truth, as well as of Dr. *Claget's determination*, on which he lays no small stress, amounts to no more than this, *that the Protestant religion stands firm upon the foundation of the old miracles of the Gospel; and that Protestants consequently, if they are consistent with themselves, ought to be content with those old miracles, and neglect all the rest.* And this, I say, is as much as Dr. M——n can expect from the generality of those, who may happen to read his *Introductory Discourse*. For he is not so weak as to imagine, that an argument so new, and so little understood, and urged in contradiction to the most inveterate prejudices, can carry conviction with it every where, to the length of his own persuasion; or prevail at once over the testimony of 16 centuries. Yet he may flatter himself without vanity, that whether the primitive miracles be thought true or false, he shall convince the cool and considerate part of his readers, that the Protestant cause has no concern at all with them, and will find it's best defence and security, both against
the

the Papists and the Freethinkers, in a total neglect and rejection of them.

This is what the Observer himself has granted in effect; and what many more, I dare say, will grant with him, upon the perusal of *the Introductory Discourse*. The onely difference is, that every liberal inquirer, who seeks truth and instruction from the use of books, will acknowledge the conviction which he receives with some civility towards his instructor: whereas this writer seems to be of that class, who look upon every attempt to instruct, as an invasion on their province, and an affront to their sufficiency; and make it their business therefore, to write against all who venture to offer their thoughts to the public, without their license. With this hostile temper, he attacks the Author of *the Discourse*, tho' he had never personally offended him; and labors to fix some malignity upon his writings, tho' he owns them at last to be innocent; and when he is driven to the acknowledgement of any truth, does it with so ill a grace, as shews that he has some reason still within himself to wish rather that it had been false.

To

To conclude; there are two or three facts, which I would particularly recommend to the reader's consideration, as being not only of great weight in the present controversy, but admitted also as true by all the adversaries of *the Introductory Discourse*.

1st, That a great part of the primitive miracles, and especially those of the 4th century, were mere fictions, contrived and imposed by the crafty upon the credulous part of the Christians of that age.

2^{dly}, That if all the miracles of all ages, after the Apostles, were found to be of the same stamp, the authority of the Gospel could not be shaken by it.

3^{dly}, That at the time of the Reformation, the only time in all history when the miracles of the Church were freely examined by Christians themselves, they were all found to be false.

Now a proper attention to these facts, and the consequences of them, must be sufficient, one would think, to supersede all farther dispute on this question; and to convince every sensible and unprejudiced reader of the reasonableness,

ableness, not onely of suspecting, but of rejecting all other miracles, except those of the Scriptures. It is certain at least, that it must expose the absurdity of these Zealots, in alarming a Protestant nation with apprehensions of danger from the free discussion of an argument, which by their own confession can do no mischief to any system of Christianity, but what is now professed and practised by the Church of *Rome*.

REMARKS

R E M A R K S
ON THE
J E S U I T - C A B A L :

REMARKS

ON THE

JESUIT-CABAL.

WHEN I sat down to examine this *Defence of Dr. Chapman's Charge*, I could not help amusing myself a while, with the quaintness of the *Title-page* ; which seemed to have undergone several corrections, and to have cost the Archdeacon no small pains, before it was reduced to it's present form. In the first Advertisement, which was given of it, in the public papers, the Title, if my memory does not deceive me, stood thus ; *The Jesuit's Cabinet farther opened, &c.* But the notion of opening a Cabinet, being vulgar, and what every writer would use on such an occasion, was thought unworthy, it seems, of the Archdeacon's erudition, and changed therefore, as we now see,

into the more recondite phrase, *of opening a Cabal* [y].

In the latter part also of the same title, some alteration appears to have been made, after the book was sent to the Press: for in that first Advertisement likewise, if I remember right, the Author of the Postscript was called *a Scurrileus*, as well as *Declamatory Remarker*; whereas in the publication of it, the word, *Scurrilous*, is now omitted: from what motive, I cannot say; but certainly, not from any scruples on the Archdeacon's part: for

[y] This change however was not made at once; nor would *Cabinet* have slipped so easily into *Cabal*, if it had not been prepared by some previous emendation: and there is reason to think, that, in running over all the changes into which it might naturally be resolved, *Cabala* was his first choice, and inserted accordingly into the Title, while the book was yet in the Press; as a word, the best adapted to the profundity of his own erudition, as well as to that mystery of iniquity, which he was going to lay open. For about the middle of his piece, he refers us, as it were, to the Title, so reformed, and speaks in express terms of *Father Harduin's Cabala*. [Def. p. 23.] Yet on more mature deliberation, *Cabala* was finally reduced to *Cabal*; which answered more directly to the purpose, both of his *Charge and Defence*, and conveyed that very notion, which he there labors to inculcate, of *a number of men*, engaged and confederated in this Jesuitical plot.

though

though his friends might persuade him, that an expression so gross would be too glaring in the first page, yet none of them could restrain him, from using it with all freedom in the second.

From this short view of the Title-page, let us pass on to the book itself; which I take the liberty to call *Dr. Chapman's*; not because common fame calls it so; nor because he had declared a resolution, of writing and publishing *a Defence of his Charge*; but because it is a work of that kind, which no body could have written but himself: because the stile, the matter, and, to borrow a little of his own language, the whole *figuration and indifferentism* of it shew *the Jesuit-Cabal* to be a *Chapman-Performance*.

The first paragraph will confirm the truth of it, which begins with these words. *A late Author, who, for reasons best known to himself, did not care for expressing his name*, has appeared very captious and splenetic against the Rev. *Dr. Chapman*. Now would a writer of any judgement begin an anonymous work, with a piece of raillery of this kind, without feeling,

that it would turn upon himself, and serve as well, for the exordium of his Adversary's Reply, as his own Defence? their names are equally suppressed on both sides; and for reasons too best known to themselves; yet there is this difference, that the reasons of the Author of the Postscript, though best known to himself, may be understood likewise by others; whereas it would be difficult for Dr. *Chapman*, to assign any, but his great modesty, for the concealment of his name; who, from a consciousness of the public favor, and his own superior merit, can venture to boast, in this very paragraph, "of the strength, the spirit
 " and the perspicuity of his *Archidiaconal*
 " *Charge*; and of the honors, which have
 " been paid to him on that account, by several distinct Assemblies of the Clergy; can
 " appeal to a character, which, it is not
 " possible to hurt, with any man living, who
 " knows him; and promise better entertainment to his readers, than his *Scurrilous* Antagonist can afford." But whatever his meaning might be, in this first stroke of his raillery, it happened unluckily for him, that
 his

his jest was spoiled, before it was out, and the Postscript had acquired the name of it's Author, before the *Jesuit-Cabal* was yet published.

In the next sentence however, he professes a most intimate acquaintance with his anonymous Adversary, and to know the very inside of him ; and, with the zeal of another *St. Jerom*, declares, that the evil spirit, which prompts him to write at this rate, is *excessively galled, and stung by the fame and success of his writings, and cannot bear the approbation, with which they have been received ; but is so full of spleen and resentment, that if he did not give a vent to those passions, by this scurrility of sneering*, they would certainly burst him. In answer to which, I can take upon me to affirm with great truth, in the name of Dr. M——, the Author of the Postscript ; that he has never conceived the least degree of spleen from any of his performances, though some of them have been published against himself, but has constantly reaped that pleasure from them, which a liberal mind will always enjoy, from the works of a dull, conceited, bigotted Ad-

versary, who had forwardly and petulantly attacked him, to find him destitute of every talent, which could recommend them to the public ; and to see the efforts of his zeal and bigotry in great measure defeated, by the dullness and perplexity, with which he labors to inculcate them. Nor has Dr. M—— ever been conscious, of bearing envy to any man whatsoever, for the superiority of his parts or learning, or, what is more commonly the object of it, his preferments ; but finds great reason to be content with his present share, as well of fortunes, as of credit in the world ; and to esteem that competency of both, with which Providence has blessed him, and that leisure, freedom and independency, which he has always enjoyed, above all the advantages, which he might possibly have acquired, by giving a more ambitious turn to his Life and Studies. And he should think more contemptibly of himself, than even his enemies affect to do, and that he had spent his time and pains to very little purpose, if at his years and in his circumstances, he had suffered it to be in the power, I will not say, of a little Archdeacon, but

but of a late great Archbishop, to give any disturbance to the ease and quiet of his mind. The sole disgust, which he can receive from any of them, and that, on the publick account, not on his own, is to see them encouraging and inculcating such a spirit of superstition and credulity in a Protestant Church, as the Papists themselves would be ashamed of: and he considers it, as the chief credit and comfort of his life, that he has the sense to condemn, and the resolution to oppose all such attempts, and their Authors, by whatever name or title they may be dignified and distinguished.

With this view he published a few remarks on *Dr. Chapman's Archidiaconal Charge*, which, instead of galling, had given him the pleasure of laughing at it more heartily, than any composition of that kind, which he had ever seen, as being, of all others, the most elaborately ridiculous. Nor was it the purpose of those remarks, to cast a *blemish*, as he intimates, on his envied fame, but to do a piece of justice to the real merit both of the *Charge* and it's Author, by that best and gentlest method of correction, which nature has ordained in such

a case, of laughing him down into his proper rank and character. This was the just treatment, which his Charge received, not onely from the Author of the Postscript, but from every body else : and this Defence of it, I doubt, will hardly deserve any other. Of which however, we shall be better able to judge, after we have taken a view of those parts of it, which may seem to demand a more serious regard.

There are two capital points, which he is obliged to make good, if he really means to vindicate his *Charge* from the exceptions of *the Postscript*,

1st, That *Father Harduin's plot* has been carried on with great success for half a century past, and spread it's infection far and wide, so as to be threatening the greatest danger, and working incredible mischief at this very time, to the religion, learning and liberty of all Protestants.

2dly, That the writings and authority of *St. Jerom* are of peculiar service, to confirm the religion of Protestants, in opposition

tion to the present worship and religion of the Papists.

As to the first of these points, which is the principal subject of his *Charge*, the dispute between us is, not about the natural tendency of the Jesuit's scheme ; or the mischiefs, which it might have wrought, if it had met with a general reception in the world ; or the sentiments of a few particular men, or the private wishes of the whole body of the Jesuits, concerning it ; but the sole question is, whether it has ever found such a degree of credit, and been carried so far into execution, as to create any real danger, or to work any actual mischief to the Protestant cause, in any country whatsoever, and especially in *England*, where this alarm was given.

This, I say, is the single point in the dispute : yet when we come to examine, what new light the Archdeacon has produced, towards clearing up this question of fact, we find nothing more in his *Defence*, than what we had seen before in his charge ; a cloud of authorities, without any weight ; an ostentation of learning, without sense ; his affirmations

tions refuted by his concessions ; till the summi of his defence is not onely reduced to nothing, but the balance turned against himself ; as every one must see, who will take the pains, to cast up the account, and weigh the particular articles on the one side, against those of the other.

For instance ; on the affirmative side, he sets forth ;

1st, “ That *Father Harduin's* obnoxious
 “ pieces were licensed by *two Provincials of*
 “ *the Jesuits*, upon a certificate from three
 “ Divines of the same order, that they con-
 “ tained nothing repugnant to the Catholic
 “ faith and good morals [x].

2dly, “ That *Cardinal de Bissy* gave broad
 “ hints, in his pastoral instructions, of his
 “ favorable inclinations to the Jesuit's scheme
 [a].

3dly, “ That seven or eight particular
 “ men, in different parts of *Europe*, *M. Bal-*
 “ *lonfeaux*, a President of the Senate at *Lux-*
 “ *embourg* ; a Gentleman at *Amsterdam* ; the
 “ Editor of *Harduin's* works ; *M. Percham-*

[x] See Def. p. 8, 9.

[a] p. 19.

“ *baud,*

“ *baud*, a President of the Parliament of *Bre-*
 “ *tagne* ; a literary Journalist at the *Hague* ;
 “ an anonymous writer of great fire and zeal ;
 “ an Antiquarian of no small note, at *Lyons* ;
 “ had all of them done, or said, or written
 “ something or other, in favor of *Harduin's*
 “ scheme [*b*].”

All which testimonies he closes with a character of *Harduin*, given in the Protestant acts of *Leipfic*, 1735 ; in which he is declared to be a writer of a *wonderfull genius, whose works will give pleasure to all, who read them, though they breath in all parts more of genius, than of truth* [*c*].

This is the summa of all the positive evidence, by which he pretends to demonstrate the success and danger of this Jesuitical scheme ; in abatement of which, he grants at the same time,

1st, “ That the Superiors, and Principals of
 “ all the Colleges and Societies of the
 “ Jesuits in *France*, published a formal
 “ protestation against it, in the name
 “ of their whole Order, and obliged

[*b*] p. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. [*c*] p. 21, 22.

“ *Har-*

“ *Harduin* publickly to retract it. And
 “ that he does not quæstion the sincerity
 “ of those Superiors [*d*].

2dly, “ That when Cardinal *de Bissy*, ven-
 “ tured to publish some hints in favor
 “ of it, five or six Bishops made an
 “ outcry against him to the King [*e*].

3dly, “ That the Critics and Scholars in
 “ general of all countries, treated it as
 “ an extravagant, chimerical and im-
 “ practicable whim [*f*]: that all the
 “ ingenuous among the *Jesuits them-*
 “ *selves*, many *Benedictins* and *Sorbo-*
 “ *nists*, and several other orders in *France*
 “ and *Italy*, sharply declared their ab-
 “ horrence of it: that in particular, the
 “ learned Fathers *Tournemine* and *Grain-*
 “ *ville*, made strong declarations against
 “ it; and the men of sense and learn-
 “ ing in *Rome*, such as *Quirini* and
 “ *Fontanini* talked with great freedom
 “ and abhorrence of it, and as he believes,
 “ with great sincerity and truth [*g*].

[*d*] See Charge, p. 17. note (+) Def. p. 10, 11.

[*e*] Def. p. 19. [*f*] Charge, p. 10, 11, 20. Def. 5, 6.

[*g*] See Charge, p. 11, 20. Def. p. 5, 6, 10, 18, 24, &c.

From this abstract of what he has affirmed on the one side, and granted on the other, the reader will see at once, that his affirmative proofs are infinitely overbalanced by his negative concessions.

He will see, that the solemn and sincere protestation of all the Superiors of the Jesuits, must far outweigh *the License of a Provincial*; a mere matter of form; and reaching no farther, than to testify the consistency of the Scheme with the *Catholic faith and good manners*.

That the loud remonstrances of five or six Bishops would have a greater effect, than the hints onely of a single Cardinal.

That the general consent of the Critics and Scholars of all countries and Sects; *Jesuits, Benedictines, Sorbonists*, and several other Orders, in *France and Italy*, with all the men of learning in *Rome*, is of much greater authority, than the opinions of seven or eight private men, of what rank or condition soever. In short, he will see, I say, at once, that neither the Archdeacon's *Charge* nor *Defence*, can have any thing rational or solid in it, or worthy of
I
any

any other treatment, but what it has met with, of being contemned and laughed at by all men of sober sense. For should we wave all his concessions, and refer the dispute to the sole merit of his positive testimonies ; we shall find them utterly trifling and impertinent, and of no significancy at all towards the confirmation of his argument ; amounting, as we have seen, to nothing more than this, *that all people admired the great parts and erudition of Father Harduin, and some few, here and there, of less learning, yet as much enthusiasm perhaps, seemed also to approve his Scheme.* And was any Scheme ever published by a man of reputation, how extravagant and chimerical soever, which had not the luck, to find some admirers, and to strike the fancy of a few, as wrongheaded and wild as the Author himself : yet in the present case, it is very remarkable, that, in *England*, where this alarm was given, not so much as a single person has ever been said, or suspected, to have paid the least regard to it.

But let us go still farther, and grant the Archdeacon much more, than he can either
claim,

claim, or desire for the advantage of his cause, that the whole Romish Church is unanimous and zealous in the defence of *Harduin's* Scheme ; yet even on this hypothesis, it would be ridiculous, to talk of any particular danger or mischief from it to Protestants, while they continue firm and united in their contempt of it ; as it is evident from fact and experience : for instance ; there are no articles of Popery so universally professed in that Church, as the *Supremacy of the Pope*, and *Transubstantiation* ; nor any, so directly fatal to Protestantism, wherever they are received in any country : but though they are enforced by the whole united power of the Romish Church, and with many subtil arguments both from reason and Scripture, yet Protestants are under no particular alarm, nor think themselves in any immediate danger on that account ; because they have the sense and learning, to discern the absurdity of them, and their mischievous effects on Society in general, as well as on the Protestant religion in particular. Much less can they apprehend any harm from the Jesuit's whim, which, if it had not been too extravagant, might indeed have

F

raised

raised a party for it among the Romanists, by it's tendency to advance the power of the Pope and the Church, but has no relation whatsoever to Protestants; nor any thing in it, that could invite any party or Sect of that profession to embrace it.

Should we suppose then, that the Papists were either divided about it, or united in it's defence; the sole effect, which could reasonably be expected in either case, would finally turn to the hurt, not of Protestantism, but of Popery itself. For by creating a division in that Church, it must in some measure weaken the strength of the whole; or by uniting the whole in it's support, would gradually reduce it again to that state of ignorance and implicit credulity, from which our Ancestors were delivered by the Reformation; and by restraining the learning and religion of their Clergy, to Church-traditions, Canons, and Papal decrees, would render them onely less formidable, and more contemptible to the Protestants. To alarm us therefore with a Scheme, which, though calculated to serve some particular purposes of Popery, was yet found too chimerical by Papists them-

themselves, to be applied to any purpose, is as contradictory to common sense and reason, as the absurd conceit of the Jesuit on which it is grounded.

The Archdeacon however takes great pains to shew, that the Protestants abroad made vehement outcries against it, as *a refinement of the whole Jesuitical order*, and dangerous consequently to their religion. And it is not to be wondered at, that a Scheme of that nature, published by a man of *Harduin's* character, should at first create a suspicion among Protestants, of being more deeply rooted and strongly supported, than it afterwards appeared to be : or till *some good men* among them, as the Archdeacon says, perceived it to be *too extravagant to do any mischief* [b]. Yet, notwithstanding the authority of these *good men*, there were others, it seems, not so good perhaps, yet more sagacious, who continued still to cry out against it as loudly as ever. Nor is this likewise strange, that in the Protestant countries abroad, there should be a sort of men, whom we frequently see at home, who from motives

[b] See Charge, p. 20.

of vanity, or interest, or ambition, yet under a mask always of religion, are catching all occasions of recommending themselves to public fame and honors, by an affected ostentation of their zeal, and learning and services to the Church : and it is easy to imagine, how the example of that *late great ornament of Berlin, Mr. La Croze*, whose testimony makes such a figure in this Defence, might excite the zeal and emulation of the *Great Archdeacon of Sudbury*, and suggest to him the plan, and subject of his Charge.

But tho' he has offered nothing in this Defence, which, in any light or view, tends to confirm the argument of his Charge; yet it is curious to observe, that he makes frequent use of several topics, which directly overthrow it. For example, in demonstrating the great danger of *Harduin's Scheme*, he often reminds us, how all the Protestants, from the beginning to this day, have constantly decried and rejected it. Now if in any of those Assemblies of the Clergy to which his *Charge* was addressed, any one had risen up in opposition to him, with intent to calm those terrors which he had been infusing,

what

what could he have said more effectual to allay them, than what the Archdeacon had applied to excite them? By assuring his Reverend brethren, “ that whatever he had been declaring “ to them with so much solemnity concerning “ the dangers of the plot, they need not be “ under any concern or alarm about it: for “ tho’ the *Romanists* might in some measure be “ divided about it, the *Protestants* were all firm “ to a man, in their contempt and rejection of “ it: that half a century was now past, in “ which it had been exerting all it’s force, “ without making the least impression on any “ Protestant Church or Sect whatsoever: that “ in *England* especially, where this alarm was “ now given, not a single soul was ever suspected of being tainted with it in any degree: “ that their own ignorance of this pretended “ danger was a sure proof, that there was really “ none: and that it was a gross insult upon the “ sense, the judgement, and the vigilance of “ the *English* Clergy, to talk to them with such “ assurance of a desperate plot, and the *incredible* mischiefs which it had been working to “ their religion for so many years, and which

“ none of them, all that time, had either the
 “ sagacity to discover, or the zeal to oppose,
 “ but their worthy Archdeacon. That they
 “ should reflect on what he himself had told
 “ them in this very *Charge*, how the plot could
 “ never obtain it's end, *till all the writers and*
 “ *monuments of Antiquity, which obstructed it,*
 “ *were cancelled and exterminated; and till the*
 “ *Jesuits, by their arts, had diffused a general*
 “ *neglect and disregard of them among the Pro-*
 “ *testants* [i]. That not one of all those an-
 “ cient writers had yet been cancelled, nor the
 “ least disregard to them diffused by Jesuitical
 “ arts, thro' any Protestant country: whence it
 “ was evident to every man of sense, that the
 “ plot had utterly miscarried from the very be-
 “ ginning, and that they were as remote from
 “ any dangers of it at this day, as their Fathers
 “ had been before them, and in short, that,
 “ from the first to the last, there never was,
 “ nor ever could be any danger in it at all.”

If this alone, I say, had been urged in an-
 swer to his Charge, at the time when it was de-
 livered, as it might have been with the strictest

[i] See Charge, p. 9.

truth,

truth, it must needs have convinced the audience, that all the terrors, with which the Arch-deacon had been alarming them, were but affected or imaginary, and his tragical representation of them a mere farce and piece of mockery, which the experience of fifty years, and of all Protestant Churches had utterly confuted.

Again, We may observe, both from his *Charge and the Defence* of it, that *the Critics, the scholars and the learned* are supposed by him in general, to consider the Jesuit's Scheme as *an extravagant, impracticable and senseless whim* [k], which is sufficient likewise of itself, to refute all pretence of danger from it. For if the learned be against it, who can be for it? The success of it must necessarily depend on the judgement of the learned; being a project of that kind, which the multitude can have no notion of, but from their testimony and recommendation. If it had offered to the public some refined point of doctrine, or principle of devotion, proper to excite a spirit of fanaticism or enthusiasm in weak and pious Christians, it might indeed have reached to the populace, and proved

[k] Def. p. 5, 6, &c.

F 4

dangerous

dangerous in the issue to the peace of our Church: but as it is a quæstion of dry criticism, without any such charm in it, and which learning alone must decide, the Protestants cannot possibly receive any hurt from it, till it be first authorised by the men of sense and learning of their own profession.

Yet the Archdeacon cannot help persuading himself, that the very populace are all attentive, and taking part in this dispute: for when Dr. M—n treats the Jesuit's Scheme as a *filly whim*, and worthy onely to be laughed at by men of sense; he reproves him with his usual gravity, and says, *that tho' he is so ignorant himself, to be thus deluded, he must not expect, that even the multitude with us, are now to be so cajoled and blinded* [1]. For now, since his Charge is made public, he fancies without doubt, that it is to be found on every stall in *London*; and that every soul, who can read, is let into the Secret of *Harduin's plot*, and admiring *the strength, and spirit, and perspicuity* of language, in which he has laid open all the dark designs and *incredible mischiefs* of this *Jesuit-Cabal*.

[1] Def. p. 14.

I have

I have hitherto been attempting to shew, how all his proofs and evidences of the plot tend onely to contradict his own account of it: yet I have one testimony against it still behind, which he will own to be of more weight, than all the rest; I mean the authority of his own dear Self: who, in one of his books, publish'd some years ago, taking occasion to speak of *Father Harduin's Scheme*, declares it to be both *paradoxical and insignificant* [m]. Such was his opinion of it, before he had cooked up the plan of his *Charge*. But the *insignificancy* of the thing, which would have discouraged any other man from meddling with it, was the very motive, which prompted the Archdeacon to take it for his theme. He knew, that he could never display his wit and eloquence with such advantage; as by raising wonders out of nothing, and from an *insignificant paradox*, extorting the thanks and applauses of *several distinct assemblies of the Clergy*.

Being aware however, that he might be driven, to give up the original Scheme of the Jesuit, as *stale and obsolete*, he had projected a re-

[m] Dr. C's Euseb. Vol. 1. p. 343.

treat,

treat, to which he now recurs, and insists, *that one part of his story is so far from being stale, that it never came to light till 1733. and 1741.* Strange! that it should twice come to light, within the compass of 8 years, yet want to be brought to light a 3d time, within 5 years more. But so it was, that *no advice or account had ever been given of it in the English tongue, as he tells us, by any one before himself, not even by the late ingenious improvers of M. Bayle's Dictionary [n].* Here then he takes heart again, and begins to plume himself as much as ever, on the discovery of a 2d plot, “ more directly subservient, “ he says, to the Popish cause, and more malignant still to antiquity than the first; in “ confounding the history of 800 years, and “ in the open proscription even of the *Roman Digest, and Codes, both Theodosian and Justinianean,* to make way for the *Papal Codes* and *Canon Law*: and moreover, in a general “ massacre of all the ancient writers and monuments of the Church, to the middle of “ the 13th century: and all this concluded “ with a daring abuse on the whole Greek

[n] Def. p. 12.

“ text

“ text of the New Testament, as a version
 “ onely of the Vulgate Latin : which last was
 “ to be set up as the onely authentic text of
 “ the whole Scripture [o].”

This at last was *the Snake in the grass*, which he talks of ; or the fatal and poysonous part of the Scheme, which had hitherto been kept out of sight. But when the head of the Snake was cut off, is it not childish, to make an outcry of danger, because the tail seemed still to move? When the original Scheme had so long been exploded, and lost all power of doing mischief, is it possible, that any appendix, or fresh conceit, formed by the same Jesuit, and on the same principles, should give any just alarm, or excite the attention of men of sense? This new plot came *first to light*, he says, in 1733: let him tell us then, what hurt it has any where done, for these 14 years past. The capital mischief, which it aims at, and by which alone Protestants can be affected, is, to deprive them of their *Greek copies of the New Testament*, and to slip *the Vulgate Latin* into their hands, as the more authentic text. Yet it is certain, not onely,

[o] Def. p. 13:

that

that no Protestant Church, but that no single Protestant in his senses has ever been induced to submit to such an exchange. Whatever then any Jesuit, or the whole body of them may project or wish on this article, it must be wholly insignificant to Protestants; in whose custody, the *Greek text* will always rest secure from the danger, of being either privately stolen, or forcibly extorted out of their hands.

But as silly as all this must necessarily appear to every sensible reader, we find him wonderfully elate, on the merit of being the first discoverer of it ; and insulting his adversary upon it, with much contempt, “ was
 “ this too a tale, says he, which deserved no
 “ alarm or regard among our Clergy ? And
 “ was this good Remarker so fond of his
 “ *stales and obsolesces*, for the sake of making a
 “ little figure with them, that he could
 “ onely attend to what was published about
 “ forty years ago, and not hearken to the
 “ more recent strokes of the Jesuit, and pass
 “ them all over in the most profound silence ?
 “ The very mirror this, of Protestant candor
 “ and

“ and impartiality, towards both the Arch-
 “ deacon and the Jesuit ! [p]”

But to return to *Father Harduin's* plot. Dr. M——n. had affirmed of it in the Postscript, that *it was contemned particularly at Rome, as the delirium of a doting Critic.* On which the Archdeacon takes occasion to animadvert, in so refined a strain, both of reasoning and raillery, that I must beg leave to transcribe the intire passage, because no abstract could possibly do justice to it. Take it then in his own words.—

“ As to our Author's particular information,
 “ of the great contempt of *Father Harduin*
 “ at Rome, as if there his whole System was
 “ treated, as a mere delirium of a doting Critic,
 “ it has no great weight with me in it's
 “ present form, when I onely look back to
 “ some former informations, which were
 “ given us, of a certain *fine column near the*
 “ *Capitol at Rome* : nor do I think, that every
 “ man, who is curious in delineating and illu-
 “ strating an old *Phallus* or *Priapus*, is imme-
 “ diately to be trusted, for explaining the

[p] Def. p. 13.

genuin

“genuin thoughts of *Italian Monastics*, or a
 “*Roman Conclave*. Some indeed, I know,
 “such as *Fontanini* and *Quirini*, have talked
 “at *Rome*, with great freedom and abhor-
 “rence of *Harduin’s* projects, and I believe
 “too, with great sincerity and truth. But
 “others may talk so to a Protestant Traveller,
 “or to some tender Catholic consciences,
 “though privately among confidants, they
 “may hug and applaud the Scheme, and
 “spur on the most vigorous prosecution of
 “it, &c. [q].”

Here we see, how the Archdeacon, who
 never travelled farther, than from his College
 to *Lambeth*, professes to know, not onely what
 was said, but what was thought at *Rome*, yet
 will not allow Dr. M——n, who spent se-
 veral months in that City, to be capable of
 giving any information, of what he had either
 seen or heard in it. *I know*, says he, *that*
such men as Fontanini and Quirini, talked with
great abhorrence of Harduin’s projects. Very
 familiar truly! one would imagine him to be
 speaking of his intimate acquaintance. *Fonta-*

[q] p. 23.

nini

nini was an Archbishop, of distinguished learning and politeness, whom Dr. M——n saw almost every day during his stay at *Rome*; and, by the advantage of his friendship, had the opportunity of many free conversations at his house, with persons of the first distinction, both for their quality and literature; and among the rest, with the Pope now reigning; and after he left *Rome*, kept up a correspondence of letters with him, to the time of his death. But, what relates more to the present purpose, the character of *Harduin's* plot, which is said in the Postscript, to have obtained at *Rome*, of being the delirium of a doting Critic, is expressed in the very words, in which he received it from Monsignor *Fontanini*; whose known attachment and relation to that Court must persuade us, that he would not have used any language on that subject, which could possibly give offence there.

But the Archdeacon assigns two reasons, why Dr. M——n's informations from *Rome*, ought not to be credited. First, because the Dr. had given some false informations, it seems, before, concerning a certain fine column near the
Capitol.

Capitol. It puzzled me a while to guess, what he could mean by this insinuation : for the Dr. had never given any information about any *column* whatsoever, nor ever heard of any *fine one*, near the *Capitol*, except the *Trajan and Antonin Columns*, which are not far from it. But I found upon recollection, that this dark hint related to a certain antique stone, of a Cylindrical form, with the names of about *thirty old Roman Legions* upon it, which Dr. M——n had transcribed, for the use of a former treatise, from a printed copy of some of the Editors of those ancient Inscriptions : which transcript the Archdeacon was pleased to censure, as incorrect, because it differed from the copies of *the great Boissard and Gruter*, as he calls them, and unless they were mistaken, which he could not believe, the Dr's copy had not given the true reading [*r*]. But whatever he may believe or not believe, it is certain, that the one or the other, or both of them, more probably, were mistaken ; because they vary from each other, more than once or twice,

[*r*] See Dr. *Chapman's* Letter annexed to *Observations on the Epistles of Cic. and Brut.* p. 427.

in

in their different copies of the same inscription [b]. Yet whatever difference there may be in any copies, or whatever error in the Dr's, the sole purpose, for which it was alleged by him is evidently confirmed by them all.

It is pleasant however to observe, how the Archdeacon, out of a fondness for his criticism, grew fond of this old Stone, and erected it presently into a *Column*. *I have so much regard*, says he, *for that Column, as to wish, that Dr. M——n had examined and represented it with a little more accuracy* [i]: and in this Defence, he has now dressed it up into a *fine Column*. Yet should we ask him of what Order, he would be puzzled how to answer; and more surprized still, if it should appear at last to be *no Column* at all, but a *Cylindrical Pedestal* of some military Statue, erected anciently upon it by the army, with the names of the several Legions inscribed, which had contributed to it's dedication [k]. But whatever it might have been in it's original form,

[b] Boissard. Par. 3. 102. Grut. Inscript. p. 513.

[i] See Dr. C's Letter, *ibid.* [k] Gruter. *ibid.*

yet at present, it has so little pretension to any sort of finery, that the rolling-stone in any garden would make just as *fine a Column*, if it were set upright onely, on either of it's ends, and, if inscribed with the names of our standing regiments, as valuable a *Column* too.

But the Archdeacon's view in this reflection was, to shew how idly Dr. M——n had spent his time in *Rome*, by neglecting to bring back with him an accurate copy of this Inscription, from his own survey of it. And whatever shame may be due to him on that account, the Dr. I dare say, will take it all to himself, and freely confess, that he never so much as saw, or made any inquiry after it. He knew, that it had been transcribed and published by several different hands, and was not invited either by any beauty of the stone, or curiosity of the inscription, to spend any of his time about it. Yet he may venture to say without vanity, that he has given the public some *informations from Rome*, which it ill becomes an English Archdeacon to take such pains to discredit ; and which, for their use and importance to the Protestant religion,

I

have

have passed through several editions in our own country, as well as translations into the languages of other countries, where Protestants reside. The Papists indeed, and a few Zealots of our own Church, scarce worthy of the name of Protestants, have made it their business, as well as this Archdeacon, to decry *Dr. M——n's informations from Rome*, yet not a single article of them has ever been disproved by any : and when a Protestant Divine has the assurance, to warn people against them in this public manner, his zeal must flow from some secret motives of more weight with him, than his pretended regard either to the Protestant cause, or to an old Inscription, of no use or significancy to any cause whatsoever.

The second reason, which he gives for discrediting *Dr. M——n's informations from Rome*, is still more curious : because the Dr, in a latin work, in which he had delineated and explained many original pieces of classical antiquity, from his own collection, had exhibited the figure of an old *Phallus and Priapus*. For such a man, he says, is not to be trusted,

for explaining the genuin thoughts of Italian Monastics, or a Roman Conclave. Yet Dr. M——n has done nothing more in this case, than what his great *Boissard and Gruter*; than what *Pignorius, Begerus, Causæus, Bonanni, Montfaucon, &c.* in short, what every man, of what character, country, or religion soever, who has published collections of Antiquities, or undertaken to explain the manners and rites of the Gentile world, had constantly done before him. And yet the Dr. before he entered upon that particular argument, took care to guard himself from any just censure, and obviate all offence to his weaker readers, by premising the example, not onely of those learned moderns, but an authority still much greater, even of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, in whose words he has happened to explain the very grossest part of his subject: so that whatever shame may be thought due to him, for the *illustration of this old Phallus*, it must finally rest upon them.

Such was the ground of the Archdeacon's censure, as far as I have been able to discover it; but as to the meaning of it, it is not in

in my power to find it out. All that I can pretend to say, of such a medley of strange words, as they are jumbled together in this paragraph, is, that his *fine Column, old Phal-lus, Italian Monastics, and Roman Conclave*, make a composition of such *strong, spirited, and perspicuous* nonsense, as no other writer, but with the same vivacity of genius, and the same profundity of erudition, could possibly produce.

After he has thus vindicated himself, with regard to his discovery of the *Jesuit's plot*, and set forth his great services to the public, in alarming us so seasonably with the dangers of it, he proceeds, to do justice also to his friends, *the Tunstalls and the Marklands*, by clearing them from the suspicion of having any share in it. The warmth of his friendship would not suffer him, to overlook the least touch of mere raillery, on persons so dear to him. He imagined presently that Dr. M——n took them to be real *Loyolites*, and actually engaged with the Jesuits abroad, and that he was representing them as such to the whole kingdom; upon which, he takes occasion, to make here a public and

solemn declaration, *that he never had any thought at all, of impeaching them; that they bear no resemblance to the true Lycopites, have none of the marks upon them, and could not therefore be the object of his caveat [l]: And from this outcry against them; as he calls it, he enters into a formal defence of all the true and solid Critics, whether living or dead, whether of our own or of foreign countries; whom he declares, "to deserve love and universal esteem, as the firmest supports of truth and erudition; while those furious Drawcanfers, who proceed not by principles of criticism, but of party and policy, and would cut off at random, against all rules of true Critique, whole centuries of Authors, ecclesiastical and profane, and diffuse an universal scepticism, as to monuments of Antiquity, deserve to be marked out, as pests to the republic of letters [m]."*

Since then he has thought fit, to be so serious, on so slight an occasion, I find myself obliged to be serious too, and to make a declaration also in my turn, on the part of Dr.

[l] Def. p. 25, 26.

[m] p. 26.

M—n;

M—n; that he had no real intention, any more than the Archdeacon himself, to impeach those learned Gentlemen of any plot whatsoever; nor the least design to defraud them of that *amiable* character, which they have acquired with so much pains and study, of *true and solid Critics*. But as no mortal can know the real motives of action in another; and as the evidence especially of plots, turns not upon intentions, but overt-acts, so the whole, which I can declare of them with certainty is; that their late attempts against the works of *Cicero*, which bear some resemblance of *the Jesuit's plot*, and seem to flow from the same *malign spirit against the Ancients*, have been found upon trial, to be perfectly innocent, and incapable of doing the least hurt to any thing whatsoever; and will consequently be as little known or regarded by the next generation, as the whimsical conceit of *Harquin* was by the present.

We are now come to the second point, which the Archdeacon, as I have said, is obliged to make good, if he would vindicate his *Charge*, from the exceptions of the *Post-*

script. He has declared in that *Charge*, that the ancient Fathers of the Church, and especially *the Clements, the Chrysostoms, the Jeroms, and the Austins*, are an *armoury*, as he calls it, *on the Protestant side, continually galling the Papists in some tender part, and exposing to every common eye, the unscriptural and unprimitive crudities of the Romish principles and practices* [n]. In contradiction to which, it is affirmed by Dr. M——n in his *Postscript*, “ that the authority of those very Fathers, as
 “ it is recommended and enforced by the
 “ Archdeacon, would betray us into Popery ;
 “ and in particular, that *Chrysostom, Jerom and*
 “ *Austin*, had severally taught and practised,
 “ and warmly recommended to the practice
 “ of all Christians, certain rites and doctrines,
 “ which, from their example and authority,
 “ are practised at this day by the Romish
 “ Church, but rejected by all Protestant
 “ Churches, *as unscriptural, superstitious, and*
 “ *idolatrous* [o].”

[n] See *Charge*, p. 2. 6.
 Introd. Disc. p. 68.

[o] *Postscript* of the

This

This is the subject of the dispute between the Author of *the Charge*, and the Author of *the Postscript* : the last of whom, in order to cut off all unnecessary wrangling, and to reduce the controversy to as short an issue, as the nature of a Postscript required, chose to refer the merit of it to a few facts and instances, drawn singly from *St. Jerom*, because, of all the Fathers, he perceived him to be the peculiar favorite of the Archdeacon. Now this method of proceeding is clear and direct, and what every one would chuse to pursue, who seeks nothing but the truth : and if that had been the Archdeacon's view, he ought to have given a direct answer to those facts ; or to have balanced them at least by opposite facts, drawn from the same Father, strong and explicit in favor of the Protestant cause, as it stands opposed to that of the Papists.

But instead of this, the whole business of his *Defence* is, to draw us away from the real subject, and to amuse us with harangues quite foreign to it ; “ on the reverence due to primitive antiquity ; on the authority of the Fathers taken collectively ; on the public doctrine

" doctrine of the ancient Churches ; and par-
 " ticularly, on the admirable abilities, innum-
 " erable excellencies, and treasures of learn-
 " ing to be found in *St. Jerom* ; in conside-
 " ration of which, all their blemishes, fail-
 " ings and peccancies ought to be overlook-
 " ed ; and whatever they may have dropt of
 " in a *Papish cast*, there wants no apology for
 " it, he says, nor is there any reason to ex-
 " pect, that he should be responsible for the
 " errors or imprudences of a *Jerom*, because
 " he is supposed to be a favorite with him
 " [p]."

From this evasive way of treating the sub-
 ject, and eluding the force of plain facts, one
 would be apt to imagine, that he was giving
 up the question, and yielding the cause to
 his Adversary : yet far from any such thought,
 he assures us, " that all the facts and in-
 " stances, which have been or can be produ-
 " ced from *St. Jerom*, or any of the Fa-
 " thers, are nothing more than a few slight
 " trimmings of Popery, which may indeed
 " receive some countenance from them, but

[p] *Jef-Cabal*, p. 34, 36.

" that

“ that he will engage, from those Fathers
 “ alone, effectually to confute all the princi-
 “ pal errors of the Romanists [9].” Why
 does he not do it then, and put an end to the
 controversy at once both with them and with
 me ? and why does he chuse to harangue
 still at large ; neither producing any facts on
 his own side, nor taking notice of those al-
 ledged on the other ; yet giving his adversary
 all the while, no other title, than that of a
Declamatory Remarker ; though he grounds his
 whole argument on allowed facts, and requires
 a distinct answer to them, and refers the de-
 cision of the cause to the merit of that
 answer,

But what is still more shamefull, he de-
 clares, “ that he never appealed to any of the
 “ Ancient Fathers singly, nor in particular to
 “ *Chrysostem, Jerom or Austin* ; for knowing
 “ well what he did, he appealed onely to
 “ the primitive Fathers at large, or to the
 “ whole body of them taken collectively, but
 “ that instead of *the Fathers in general*, which
 “ was his expression, the Gentleman had slipped

[a] Ib. 35.

“ in,

“ in, *Chrysostom, Jerom and Austin*, to whom
 “ he did not appeal, nor ever intended to
 “ appeal [r].” And this indeed, if true,
 must needs be thought a slippery trick, to
 put such a change upon the good Archdeacon.
 Let us inquire then, how the case really stands;
 and whether this piece of craft, which he
 imputes to Dr. M——n, be not a proof onely
 of his greater disingenuity, and a fiction of
 his own, contrived to excuse himself from
 acting that mortifying part, which candor and
 truth prescribe, but his pride cannot submit to,
 of acknowledging himself confuted.

In the beginning of his *Archidiaconal*
Charge, where he opens the general plan of
 Father *Harduin's* plot, he speaks indeed, in
 general, of the *ancient Fathers*, as destined to
 destruction by that Jesuit, on account of their
 services to the Protestant cause [s]. Then,
 in describing the terrible havock, which the
 plot had made among the writers of Antiqui-
 ty both Greek and Latin, he tells us, that
this was onely the introduction to the more daring
stroke, by which the Clements, the Chrysostoms,

[r] *Jes-Cab.* 33, 34. [s] *Charge*, p. 2.

the

the Jeroms, and the Austins were to fall next in the Massacre, as being too eloquent and primitive for a Jesuit's palate [1]. And lastly, when he comes to set forth the probability of it's success, he says, that the libertines and sceptics would of course rejoice in it, and give up even their favorites, Virgil and Horace, &c. on condition onely, that the Jeroms might be sacrificed with them [u]. Thus he first mentions the ancient Fathers at large, as an armoury on the Protestant side; then specifies, what particular Fathers he means, as the most obnoxious on that account to the Jesuit; and lastly, takes occasion to signify, that, of the four, whom he so specifies, Jerom was the most eminently and universally odious to all the enemies of Protestantism, both Papists and Sceptics.

This is his whole account of the ancient Fathers, with regard to their being an armoury on the Protestant side: and could any one, who was disposed to contest it with him, act more candidly and pertinently, than by referring the dispute, to the character of that single Father, on whom he himself lays the

[1] ib, p. 6. [u] ib. 22.

greatest

greatest stress? Or could any one, on the other hand, act more weakly and disingenuously, than he has done in the present case, by disclaiming an appeal to *any of the ancient Fathers singly*? For, in our controversy with the Papists, the whole collective body of them could not possibly have any weight, if each of them taken singly be found to have none at all: and if he dares not trust his cause to those particular Fathers, whom he himself has distinguished, *as the peculiar armory of Protestants*, and declared to be *grievous thorns in the sides of the Papists* [x]; It is childish to pretend, that any accession of the rest, who are less usefull to us, and less grievous to our enemies, could add any new strength to it. Yet thus he shuffles on; chusing to recur rather to any shift, and to deny even what he has said, than to give a direct answer to facts, which would expose the folly and bigotry of his principles.

And to divert the attention of the reader from the merits of the cause, and raise his indignation at the same time against Dr. M--n,

[x] Jaf. Cab. p. 35.

he

he makes a wretched outcry against him, for
 “ disfiguring and depreciating the virtues and
 “ abilities of the ancient Fathers; exaggerat-
 “ ing their failings and peccancies; casting
 “ the worst construction on their actions and
 “ sayings; painting them malignantly in the
 “ most hideous colors of folly, superstition
 “ or knavery; and putting them to a worse
 “ torture, than their Heathen Persecutors had
 “ ever done, and to a fiery trial, which no
 “ writers in the world had ever suffered [y];”
 with a great deal more of the same declama-
 tory stuff, for which Dr. M——— has given
 no other occasion, than by attempting to shew,
 from express testimonies and instances drawn
 from those Fathers, that their primitive prac-
 tices and principles tend to confirm the pre-
 sent doctrines and worship of the Romish
 Church.

This is a pure question of fact, which has
 no relation to their virtues or abilities, or any
 other part of their character, than what is
 necessarily demonstrated by those same instan-
 ces, collected from their works, on which the

[y] *Jes-Cab.* 42, 43.

question

question itself depends. For example, if, in the course of our argument, they are found to affirm, either from their own knowledge or the report of others, things manifestly false and utterly incredible; what else can we possibly think, or say of them, but that, *if they believed such things, they were grossly credulous; if not, were crafty or interested, in imposing the belief of them upon others?* And how shining soever their abilities may be, this is no calumny, no exaggeration, no torture or fiery trial, but such a treatment of them, as justice and reason require, and what all writers have ever suffered and ought to suffer: and whoever forms a judgement of any Author, from any other principle, than what is grounded on the testimony of his writings, must necessarily judge from prejudice or party, or some other motive, which does not flow from the love of truth.

The Archdeacon however, though he does not chuse to give any direct answer to those particular facts, which are alledged against him from *St. Jerom*, takes no small pains, to clear the ancient Fathers in general, from the charge urged against them, of being the Authors of

those principal corruptions, which are practised at this day by the Romanists, and condemned by the Protestants, as *unscriptural and superstitious*. Which corruptions he has collected from *the Introductory Discourse* into the eight following articles. 1. *The Institution of Monkeny*. 2. *The worship of reliques*. 3. *Invocation of Saints*. 4. *Prayers for the dead*. 5. *The superstitious use of Images*. 6. *Of the Sacraments*. 7. *Of the Sign of the Cross*. 8. *Of consecrated Oil* [z].

This poor list of primitive corruptions, and it's eight articles, our Protestant Archdeacon derides, as trifling and impertinent; and of no consequence at all to us, whether they were practised or not, either by the Antient or Modern Church of Rome. *These*, says he, *are all the great instances of agreement, which our Author can find between Popery and Antiquity: and what are these? Why, the facts and instances, which have been answered by Protestants over and over* [a]. And to justify his contempt of them, he touches here and there the chief of those arguments, which have so

[z] Ib. 28. [a] Ib.

H

often

often been urged in answer to them. 1. *That though there are several passages in the Fathers, which seem to have a Popish cast, and to look a little Popishly affected, yet it may bear a dispute, as it has often done, whether the cases on both sides be similar* [b]. 2. *That it is another question, whether the Primitive Churches are chargeable, in these articles, with any leaven of Romish Superstition at all. Nay, he is sure, that we may appeal, in these very articles, to the practice of the antient Churches, against the Church of Rome* [c]. 3. *That the usages of this kind are really nothing to the mimicry and fogeries of the later Popish rituals* [d]. 4. *That the articles here charged upon the Primitive Fathers, are not the principal corruptions of Popery; nor in truth any Popery at all, but only a few trimmings of Popery* [e].

But if Popery, as he contends, was not yet in being, how could the Fathers add trimmings to it? Or if his meaning be, that they trimmed up Christianity into the form and dress of Popery; the onely sense, that his

[b] Ib. 33, 35, 36.

[c] Ib. 29.

[d] Ib. 32.

[e] Ib. 29, 35.

words naturally convey, I shall readily agree with him, and cut short the dispute. But instead of allowing any thing, so candid or sensible; he presents us with a different picture of Popery, and a genuin list of *it's principal corruptions and crying abominations*, as he calls them, and defies any man to shew, *that so much as one of these ever appeared in any Christian Church, before A. D. 440 [f]*. Yet should we grant all this, and whatever he can say of the same kind, to be true, it is nothing to the purpose, as the reader will easily perceive, by reflecting onely on the genuin nature of Popery, and the real state of our present quæstion.

For it must be remembered, that Popery is a system, of a very complex and comprehensive kind, which could not possibly be formed at once, or brought to maturity, but by the gradual improvements of successive ages. The Primitive Fathers, and especially those of the fourth Century, were the Founders of it; sketched out the plan, laid a sure foundation, raised a great part of the Fabrick, and left sufficient funds and materials, for carrying on

[f] Jes-Cab. 27, 28.

H 2

the

the rest to it's full perfection. And we might with as much reason deny, that *Romulus*, and the Primitive Kings, who succeeded him, were the founders of the antient state of *Heathen Rome*, because they did not raise it to that height of power, which it afterwards reached ; as that the primitive Fathers were the founders of the present state of *Popish Rome*, because they left a part of their work to be completed by their Successors. In both cases, the foundations were so effectually laid, and the plan carried so far into execution, that the rest would succede of course, if it was not totally deserted ; and from causes and principles, of a kind somewhat similar. For the Kings of old *Rome*, that they might secure their infant state, and enlarge it's dominion, contrived such a system of laws and religious rites, as would naturally excite a kind of fanatical zeal and enthusiastic fondness for them in the people, whom they trained at the same time in such bodily exercises, as were proper to confirm both their strength and their courage : by the united force of which principles, the *Heathen* world became subject to the power of that

that Republic. Thus also, the Primitive Fathers, by the invention of certain rites and methods of devotion, with a severity of bodily exercises, and peculiar rules of life, which carried a form of sanctity, and were enforced by a pretence of miracles, infused into the multitude a spirit of zeal and superstition, too impetuous to be checked, by the opposition of calm reason, which gradually subjected the Christian world to the dominion of Popish Rome.

This is a short sketch of the rise and progress of Popery. It drew it's birth from the primitive ages of the Church; was nursed by the Fathers of the same ages, especially of the fourth Century, and attained gradually to it's present maturity, by the help chiefly of those articles, above recited, which were invented for that purpose and zealously propagated by the same Fathers. The Archdeacon however is sure, *that even in these articles, we may appeal to the antient Churches in opposition to the Romish Church*; and to prove the truth of what he says, has taken the pains to shew, in every one of them, how far the practice of the primi-

tive Churches was different from the present practice of *Rome* : through all which therefore, it will be necessary for me, to follow him with a remark or two on each particular article.

The Substance, of what he has thought fit to declare, on the subject of these several articles, is as follows.—

1. *That there were no Monks in the Church for near three hundred years ; and when they were introduced, they were under no Popish vows or bonds ; nor encroached on the rights of the Bishops and Clergy ; nor held estates in mortmain ; nor were the creatures and tools of the Popes of Rome.*

The reader will observe, that though our dispute principally turns on *the rites and doctrines of the fourth century*, which the Arch-deacon has undertaken to vindicate from a conformity with the present Superstitions of *Rome*, yet in this first article of *Monkery*, he owns it to have been introduced even in the third century ; with this difference only, *that it was not yet under any Popish vows ; nor encroached on the rights of the Bishops ; nor engrossed*

grossed estates; nor was a tool to the Popes. Now the fact is this, as it is represented by the Fathers themselves, that towards the end of the fourth century, there was such an amazing increase of the Monkish Order, through all parts of the Christian world, as makes it reasonable to believe, that there were greater numbers of Monks in the Church, in proportion to the extent of Christendom at that time, than are to be found in it even at this. Which was wholly owing to the zeal of those Fathers, who made it their business to recommend and extol the Monastic State, as the perfection of a Christian life, and the very pattern of an heavenly one. These Monks lived also then, as they do now, in Monasteries, founded for their sole use and reception, and under a solemn profession, or vow of perpetual chastity; voluntary, as we may imagine at first; till by their frequent violations of it, they were gradually tied down by more strict and forcible restraints. And if they did not immediately *encroach on the rights of others, and engross estates, or become tools of the Popes;* yet such effects were sure to follow from the

very nature of their institution : for it is not possible, that such numerous societies of beggarly, crafty, ambitious spirits, recommended by a reputation of wonderfull sanctity, could long subsist without acquiring both rights and estates, and attaching themselves to that power, which was the best able to protect them in such usurpations. And we find accordingly, that they made it their care, from the very beginning, to seduce the heirs of rich families into their Monasteries, against the will, and to the utmost grief of their parents, and to conceal them there, from the knowledge and search of their friends. Nor are we to suppose, that any of their later encroachments are derived from any written statutes or rules, by which modern Monks are governed, in distinction from the ancient, but from such arts onely, as experience would teach of course and tacitly prescribe to all societies of the same kind.

2. *That there were no invocations of Saints or Angels in the three first centuries ; and even in the fourth, the addresses to them, were more like rhetorical Apostrophes (such as that of Dr. M——n to Dr. Woodward) than formal petitions :*

tions: and no prayers to them were admitted in the public Offices of the Church, before A. D. 500.

On this article it is allowed by the Arch-deacon, that in the fourth century, such addresses were made to Saints and Angels, and such religious honors paid to them, which, within a few generations after, produced a direct worship, and a *formule of prayers to them in the common Liturgies of the Church*. But here he has met with a lucky occasion, as he fancies, of distinguishing all this away, and giving a stroke at the same time to Dr. M--n, which must needs strike him dumb, by shewing, that the addresses paid to Saints, in the fourth century, were nothing more, than *such rhetorical Apostrophes*, as the Dr. himself had applied, in a certain latin speech, to his deceased friend, *Dr. Woodward*. As if such little attempts of Oratory, or fallies of fancy, made to enliven a latin oration, in an Assembly of Scholars, could bear any analogy, to the religious addresses paid to Saints, on bended knees and in a suppliant posture, in Churches dedicated to their names, and before their Altars,

and

and their reliques, according to the manner of that century. But whatever wit or smartness there may be in the application, it is wholly borrowed from a printed pamphlet, in which the same turn is given to the *Saint-worship* of those primitive ages.

3. *That the Popish worship of reliques cannot be found in the Orders of the Church, before the middle of the fourth century : and that it was not made an article of faith, and added to the Apostle's Creed, till the time of Pope Pius IVth : a presumption unknown to the Ancient Churches.*

Here again we find an identity of practice, in the primitive Church of the fourth century, and the present Church of *Rome*, in one of the most offensive and grossest superstitions of all Popery. Which, though not formally declared to be *an article of faith*, in those antient times, yet was believed as firmly, and had the same effect, *as an article of faith*, in all times, or it could not otherwise have obtained so universal an establishment. And to say the truth, a worship confirmed by a perpetual succession of miracles, had a just claim to be treated as such, in all ages and Churches, where those miracles were believed to be true.

4. *That*

4. That the *superstitious use of Images* was never heard of in the *primitive times* ; nor can any one Father of the fourth century be produced to favor it.

It is certain however, that *Images* were introduced into the Churches, in the fourth century, and, as *St. Austin* expressly declares, found *many adorers of them* in that age [g]. And in the following ages, it is notorious, that the worship of them was practised and propagated by all the Fathers. Yet in the fourth century I have met with a story, which seems to confute the Archdeacon's peremptory assertion, on this article, by the authority of one of the most illustrious Fathers of that time, even *the great St. Basil*. The story is this, “ that as that venerable Father
“ was fervently praying before *the Image of the*
“ *blest Virgin*, to which there was annexed
“ also a picture of *St. Mercurius the Martyr* ;
“ he received a divine revelation from the
“ picture of that Saint, by which it was
“ signified to him, that *Julian the Apostate*,
“ for whose destruction he was then particu-

[g] See Introd. Disc. p. 21.

larly

“ larly putting up his prayers, was in that
 “ very instant of time actually destroyed [b].”

5. *That the superstitious abuses of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which are charged in the Introductory Discourse, on the Fathers of the fourth century, are tales quite forein to the purpose; of mixing the water with the wine, and sending the consecrated elements to the absent, and the like: since no Popish distinction of seven Sacraments; no Transubstantiation; adoration of the Host, and propitiatory Sacrifices of the Mass are brought to light from that quarter.*

Yet besides those tales, which he calls forein to the purpose, it is shewn in the same place, though he omits to take notice of it, that such notions and usages prevailed, in that age, with regard to this Sacrament, as were but very little short of the Popish rites and doctrines just specified; and within a few ages afterwards actually produced them. For example, this Sacrament was then held to be *a tremendous mystery, dreadfull even to Angels; and constantly stiled the Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and offered up as such, both for the*

[b] Joh. Damascen. Op. T. 1. p. 327. E. Edit. Par.

dead

dead and the living, over the tombs and ashes of departed Saints and Martyrs : which was either the same thing, with what is now called the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, or at least a very near approach to it. The consecrated bread likewise, was locked up in boxes, and carried about by private Christians, as a charm, or preservative against all dangers, and believed to work miracles and drive Devils out of haunted houses ; and in short, to perform such astonishing wonders, that it was not possible to take it any longer for mere bread, but something apparently divine and worthy of adoration ; and transubstantiated consequently into the real body of Christ, for nothing else could naturally flow from these principles and practices of the fourth century.

6. That prayers for the dead were in use indeed among the primitive Christians ; but not such, as the Papists now use, for the relief of Souls in Purgatory ; because the doctrine of a Purgatory was not established till after the fourth century : and the testimonies alledged in favor of it, from Tertullian and Origen, were onely the private opinions of those Fathers, not the general doctrine of the Church. Here

Here the superstitious practice of *praying for the dead* is acknowledged to have been used by the Primitive Christians, as it certainly was, from the earliest ages, after the days of the Apostles. The purpose of it, as it is declared by *Tertullian* and *Origen*, was, to procure some relief and *refreshment to departed Souls, in an intermediate state of expiatory pains* [i]. And though the Church had not yet publicly avowed the doctrine of such a *purgatorial* state, yet from the general practice of *praying for the dead*, we may certainly infer a general persuasion of it, as the principle, on which the practice itself was grounded. Which seems even demonstrable, not onely from the testimonies of *Tertullian* and *Origen*, but from the actual establishment of a *Purgatory*, which within a short time after was openly avowed, as the doctrine of the Catholick Church. Let the Archdeacon therefore invent what distinctions he pleases, it will be evident to all men of sense, that *the doctrine of a Purgatory*, with all the lucrative effects, which have since been derived from it to the Popish Church, was

[i] Introd. Disc. 18, 19.

directly

directly founded on the usages of the fourth century.

7. *That the ill uses of the Sign of the Cross, and of oil, were unknown to the Pastors and offices of the Church for near three hundred years. In baptism indeed, and in sickness, they had a ceremony of anointing with oil, and hoped in some instances for miraculous cures from it; yet these and other primitive usages of the same kind were nothing to the mimicry and jopperies of the later Popish rituals.*

In these two last articles, all that he pretends to declare is, that the abuses of them were unknown to the primitive Church for near three hundred years; whereas his argument required, that they should have continued unknown to the end at least of four hundred. Yet from his own account of them, we may collect, that such abuses of them were actually introduced within these three hundred years, as would necessarily create all the rest. For instance, *they anointed sick persons with oil, in the primitive Church, and expected miraculous cures from it. They do the very same thing at this day in the Romish Church, and*
with

with the same expectation : and in both Churches, miracles are said to be wrought by it, as the ground of that expectation. The onely difference is, *that the Romish Church has made a Sacrament of this Unction, which the Primitive Church never thought of.* But this is a difference of opinion, not of practice. And if miracles be really wrought by it, I see no absurdity in giving that name to it ; and am sure, that, among the Protestants, all those, who draw their religious principles from the same source of *Primitive Antiquity*, must readily allow it to be a *Sacrament*. Then as to *the Sign of the Cross*, it is affirmed likewise to have wrought many great miracles, in the fourth century ; *to have driven away Devils every where before it ; to have thrown open gates, which were shut against it ; to have been imprinted miraculously on people's garments.* And though the Archdeacon would persuade us, that usages of those times were nothing, to the mimickry and fopperies of the later Popish rituals ; yet on the contrary, it is reasonable to believe, as well from the nature of the thing, as the testimonies of the Fathers themselves, that with regard to this

this article of *the Cross*, *the fopperies of the Romish Church* are much less extravagant, than those of the primitive ages ; when it's miracles were fresh, and it's devotion ran high ; and when every Christian, as *Tertullian* says, was possessed with such superstitious notions about it, that he could not take a single step, even in private and domestic life ; *could not go out of his house, or come in ; put on his cloaths, or his shoes ; could not bath, eat, light up a candle ; go to bed, or sit down ; till he had first marked his forehead with the Sign of the Cross* [k].

Thus we see at last, how every thing, which is asserted, in *the Introductory Discourse*, on the subject of these Articles, is confirmed by the Archdeacon's own account of them. It is declared in that *Discourse*, that, in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, all those several corruptions, were either actually introduced, or the seeds of them so effectually sown, that they could not fail of producing the fruits, which we now see in *the Romish Church*. And nothing could more directly illustrate the truth of it, than what

[k] Ib. 19, 20.

I

he

he himself has here offered in contradiction to it. He tells us, that this or that article was unknown to the third century, yet allows it at the same time to have been common in the fourth; or if unknown still to the fourth, that it was practised in the fifth: or if it had not reached it's full maturity in any of those ages, yet from the seeds of it then sown, it became ripe and flourishing within a short time after. Which is the whole that Dr. M——n can be reasonably understood to mean, when he charges the present corruptions of *Rome*, to the principles and practices of the Primitive Fathers.

But in the article of *Reliques*, the Archdeacon has introduced a very remarkable testimony, which I omitted to take notice of in that place, because it seemed to require a more particular consideration: I mean the authority there alledged by him of *a late Great Prelate, Archbishop Wake, who did not scruple, he says, to declare, that as to the honors, due to the genuine reliques of the Martyrs or Apostles, no Protestant would ever refuse whatever the primitive Churches paid to them* [1]. I did not think it strange,

[1] *Jes. Cab.* 29, 30.

that

that what an Archbishop had not scrupled to declare, an Archbishop's Chaplain should not scruple to defend, yet could not help wishing, that they had both of them been more scrupulous in the present case : because I take it to be evident, as well from the dictates of reason as of religion, that how *genuin soever the reliques of the Martyrs or Apostles* may be, or whatever honors may have been paid to them by the primitive Church, no honors at all can be due to them from any Christian, out of any other principle, than of mere policy, or superstition : the truth of which I shall endeavour to illustrate, by sketching out a brief account of the rise and progress of *relique-worship* from the earliest ages of the Church.

Within a short time after the death of Christ, *St. Stephen*, one of the most eminent of the first disciples, became the *first Martyr* of the Christian Church. He was condemned to die by the great Council of the Jews, and *stoned to death accordingly* ; and after his execution, *was carried to his burial by devout men, who made great lamentation over him* [m]. This

[m] Acts viii. 2, 22, 20.

is the summ of what we read in the Gospel, on the subject of his Martyrdom ; in which *his blood is said to have been shed*, yet no care taken, to preserve the least drop of it, or any fragment of his skull, or bones, or cloaths, which might probably have been broken or rent by the violence of such a death. The piety of those *devout men*, who carried him to his grave, reached no farther in those days, than to the natural and necessary office of giving him a decent burial, and lamenting the cruel and undeserved fate of so excellent a person, and zealous champion of the Christian faith : Nor do we read any where, of an *anniversary Festival* appointed after his death, and celebrated afterwards at his Tomb, by the Apostles, or their Successors, *on the day of his Martyrdom*.

Thus the body of this great and first of the Christian Martyrs rested in it's grave, undisturbed, unknown, and unheard of, for about three hundred years ; when it is said to have been discovered, *by a revelation from heaven*, in the fourth century : an age, in which the devotion of the Church was principally turned to-
wards

wards *the reliques of it's Martyrs*. The fame of this miraculous discovery was soon spread through the Christian world by the Pilgrims, who visited *Jerusalem*; whence they brought away some little portions of *the reliques* of this Saint; for the reception of which, several *Chappels or Oratories* were built in different countries, which, according to the custom of those days, were called *the Memories* of those particular Martyrs, whose reliques were deposited in them. Some of this kind were built for *the reliques of St. Stephen in Africa*; where they are affirmed to have wrought daily miracles, of the most amazing and illustrious kind; several of which are particularly recorded and attested by *St. Austin*, from his own knowledge [n]: whose authority, with that of the other Fathers, who relate much the same stories, of *other reliques* and *other miracles* wrought by them in different countries, is the very pattern, as well as the support of the present *relique-worship* in the Church of *Rome*. If therefore the authority of a late Archbishop, now enforced by our Archdeacon, should induce us,

[n] De Civ. D. l. 22. c. 8. §. 20, &c.

to pay the *same honors to the bones of Martyrs, which were paid to them by the primitive Church*, it would plunge us at once into the very depths of Popery.

But it may be said perhaps, that tho' the Archdeacon's argument necessarily includes *the fourth Century*, within the notion of the primitive Church, yet the Archbishop's declaration must not be understood, to have reached so far, but be restrained to the earlier ages only, which succeeded immediately to that of the Apostles. Let us inquire then, how far this limitation will justify it, and what honors were paid, even by the earliest Churches, to the reliques of their Martyrs. We have already seen, how, in the days of the Apostles, there does not appear to have been the least care or thought, about preserving any *reliques of the first Martyr Stephen* ; nor after the rites of burial, any honors paid to him, but what are paid of course, to every virtuous and excellent man, by a pious and affectionate remembrance of his name and sufferings. Yet in the very next age, and within a few years after the death of *St. John*, the last of the Apostles,

Apostles, the devotion of the Church began to take a superstitious turn, in this very article : as we may collect from the antient narratives of the Martyrdoms of two, the most celebrated Disciples of that Apostle, *Ignatius and Polycarp*, which were written at the time of their execution, and by persons who attended it.

Ignatius, then Bishop of *Antioch*, was exposed to the wild beasts, in the Amphitheater at *Rome* ; on which occasion, it was his earnest prayer to God, *that the beasts might devour his body so intirely, that no remains of it should be left, to give his friends the trouble of gathering them.* And he obtained his wish so far, as the narrative informs us, *that none but the greater and harder of his holy bones remained ; yet these were gathered up, and carried to Antioch, and there wrapped up in linnen, as an inestimable treasure, left to the Church, by the grace, which was in the Martyr* [o].

In the relation also of the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*, who was burnt alive, some years

[o] See Relation of the Martyrdom of St. Ignat. translated into English by Archb. Wake. §. 12.

after, at *Smyrna*, it is said ; “ that his friends
 “ gathered up his bones, *more precious than the*
 “ *richest jewels, and tried above gold*, and de-
 “ posited them in a proper place, where they
 “ proposed to assemble themselves together, as
 “ oft as the Lord would give them opportuni-
 “ ty, to celebrate *the birth day of his Martyr-*
 “ *dom* [p].”

Such were the beginnings of the honors, paid to the *reliques of the Martyrs*, soon after the days of the Apostles : which superstition continued gradually to increase, in proportion as the Church itself increased in strength and numbers, till it reached it's full heighth upon the conversion of the Roman Empire ; when the whole Christian world seemed to be running mad, as it were, with an enthusiastic zeal for the reliques of Saints ; urged on and inflamed by the authority and eloquence of all the principal Fathers of that age. Thus *Chrysostom*, haranguing on the praises of *St. Ignatius*, to the people of *Antioch*, with whom his reliques were deposited ; “ God, says he, took
 “ him from you for a short time, but restored

[p] See ditt. of *St. Polycarp*. §. 18.

“ him

“ him with greater glory: and as those, who
 “ borrow money, pay it back again with inter-
 “ rest, so God, after he had borrowed this preti-
 “ ous treasure of you for a little while, and shewn
 “ it to the City of *Rome*, sent it back again
 “ with the greater luster. You sent him out
 “ a Bishop, but received him a Martyr: You
 “ sent him out with your prayers, but received
 “ him with crowns. And not onely you, but
 “ all the Cities on the road: for how were
 “ they all affected, think you, to see his re-
 “ liques brought back? What pleasure, what
 “ exultation of joy did they express? What
 “ acclamations of praise did they send forth
 “ from all sides on the crowned Martyr?”

[q] And about the end of the fourth century,
 as *Euagrius* relates, “ the Emperor *Theodosius*
 “ was moved by a suggestion from God, to do
 “ some greater honors to this Martyr, by
 “ translating his bones with great pomp and
 “ solemn procession, from the place, where
 “ they were first deposited, without the City,
 “ into a temple within it, which was conse-

[q] Oper. Tom. 2. p. 600. Edit. Benedict:

“ crated

“ crated on that occasion to the memory of
 “ *St. Ignatius* : whose annual Festival was
 “ rendered still more splendid and magnificent
 “ by *Gregory*, Bishop of that City [r].”

Here then we see, what was the practice of the primitive Church, with respect to *reliquies*, from the earliest ages. And after this view of it, if we should beg our Archdeacon, to inform us a little more precisely, what part a Protestant ought to act in this case ; whether with the first Christians, in the days of the Apostles, he ought to observe a *perfect indifference or neutrality about them*, neither honoring nor insulting them ; or with the first Christians, after the Apostles, *gather them with a religious care ; wrap them up in silk, or fine linnen, deposit them in sacred places, treat them as the most precious jewels, and inestimable treasures of the Christian Church* ; he would stick, I dare say, to his text ; exhort us to follow the example of the primitive Churches ; and cheerfully to perform, what the authority of those purest ages had sanctified : nor would he have any scruple, about pushing our zeal, too far ;

[r] Lib. i. c. 16.

for

for he, who to the disgrace of Protestantism, has strenuously defended the grossest superstitions, and most despicable impostures of the fifth century, cannot possibly be scandalised by the less obnoxious practices of the fourth.

I cannot conclude these remarks, without reminding the reader once more, that the reason of my appealing singly to *St. Jerom*, was, not to gain any particular advantage to my argument, by selecting a character the most liable to exception ; but on the contrary, to shorten the dispute, by offering one of the best and most valued characters of all the Antient Fathers, as a pattern or test, by which the merits of the rest shall be determined. For if a person of his superior parts and learning, distinguished by the severity of his life, as well as his piety, and zeal for the honor of the Gospel, could either be imposed upon himself by forged miracles, or knowingly impose them upon others, for the sake of recommending those superstitious rites, which are now practised by the Church of *Rome*, we need not look any farther ; the same charge will easily be admitted, as it may more easily
be

be proved against the rest. For which reason, I shall here add one short story more, from our own history, which occurs now to my memory, and may serve as a fresh illustration, of what I have before affirmed, concerning the nature and effect of his writings and principles.

At the time of the Reformation, *Dr. John Storie*, an eminent Civilian, and bigotted Papist, who, in *Queen Mary's* reign, had been a chief instrument of *Bp. Bonner's* butcheries of the Protestants, fled into *Flanders* upon the accession of *Q. Elizabeth* ; where he was seized by stratagem, and brought a Prisoner into *England*, and executed afterwards at *Tyburn*, for the conspiracies and invasions of this kingdom, which he had been projecting and soliciting abroad : and being admonished at the time of his execution, to declare somewhat concerning his religion, he chose to say nothing more, than that he *died in the faith of St. Jerom*. This he took to be a sufficient declaration of it ; and for this, he has ever since been considered as a *Saint and Martyr at Rome* ; where his martyrdom was printed, and represented in the
English

English College of that City [s]. But if *Jerom* after all, as the Archdeacon tells us, be really *on the Protestant side*, and a *grievous thorn in the sides of the Papists*, it is incumbent on him, to correct the mistake of our Historians, as well as the insolence of the Romanists, and to do justice to the memory of this celebrated Dr, by reclaiming him, as a Martyr of our own Church, and as true a Protestant as himself; having sacrificed his life in the defence of that *pure and primitive Christianity*, which he is now so zealously recommending.

But the Archdeacon, as we find, will not be provoked to give an answer to any facts, which relate to *St. Jerom*: all, which he has thought fit to say to them, amounts to little more than this; “*that Jerom* was a wonder-
“ full scholar and fine writer, and tho’ he
“ had some blemishes and peccancies, yet they
“ were too trifling to want any apology: and
“ for his own part, that he highly esteems
“ those primitive teachers and defenders of
“ Christianity, whose works he has read with

[s] See Strype’s Annals of Queen Elizabeth, Vol. -I. p. 522.

“ attention,

“ attention, in order to judge *fairly and ac-*
 “ *curately* of Christian antiquities, by the
 “ lights which he received from them ; and
 “ that a modern scholar, who should scorn
 “ to accept their assistance, would make but
 “ a *sorry kind of figure* in the republick of
 “ letters [t].”

How *fairly and accurately* his attentive study of the Fathers has taught him to judge of Christian antiquities, the reader will easily perceive, from the conclusion, which he has drawn from it, to the great comfort of Protestants ; that all these primitive Saints in general, and St. Jerom in particular, are an armoury on our side, perpetually galling the Papists, in some tender point, and exposing to every common eye the unscriptural and unprimitive crudities of their principles and practices [u]. And how usefull also the same study is, in qualifying a man, to make a figure in the world, is evident likewise, from the great fame and honors, which this same Archdeacon has raised to himself on that sole foundation.

[t] See Def. p. 36, 40, 41, 42. [u] See Churg. p. 2.

If this then be the case, and if such advantages really flow from the study of those Antients, the Papists have great reason to expostulate with him, for the injustice offered to their religion, by the very Title of his *Charge*; *Popery the bane of true letters*. For whatever we have to say against Popery, it is notorious, that it is more immediately connected with *the study of the Fathers*, and has done much more towards promoting it in the Christian world, than Protestantism: and that one single Order of Monks has published more beautifull, correct and usefull editions of their works, than all the Protestant countries together have ever done: so that by his own principles, Popery, instead of being called the *bane*, ought to be called, the *basis of true letters*; or the only school, whose scholars are rightly qualified, to *make a figure in the republic of letters*.

But this character of Popery, as it is signified by his Title, is not a contradiction onely to his own principles, but what is still worse, seems contrary likewise to truth, and the experience of those, who have visited Popish countries; in many of which, the liberal arts
and

and sciences are known to flourish in an eminent degree ; and their Cities to abound with noble and usefull libraries, open and accessible to all, while the richest and largest of all Protestant Cities is shamefully destitute of them. When we write therefore against Popery, let us be so candid, as to give it it's due ; for when we have so much truth on our side, it is a shame to recurr to lies : we may call *it's doctrines absurd ; it's rites, paganish ; it's worship, idolatrous ;* we may call it, *a system of craft and policy,* contrived to enslave the Christian world to the dominion of *the Romish Church* : but when we ascribe to it what is false, we expose ourselves to the just contempt of the Romanists themselves, and instead of discrediting their religion, give them a bad specimen of our own.

F I N I S.

